DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 028 EA 018 762

TITLE	More Effective Schools/Teaching Project. First Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	Spencerport Central Schools, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Oct 84
NOTE	160p.; In its: Spencerport Central Schools More Effective Schools/Teaching Project Documents; see EA 018 758.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Academic Standards; Annual Reports; Cooperative Planning; Definitions; *Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Educational Status Comparison; Elementary Secondary Education; Factor Analysis; *Needs Assessment; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Review (Reexamination); *School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	Connecticut School Interview; Disaggregated Analysis; New York (Spencerport)

ABSTRACT

This document is an annual status report summarizing findings of the first full year of operation of the Spencerport (New York) More Effective Schools/Teaching Project. Section 1 describes four documents (reprinted in Appendices A through D) that were developed during the project; reviews the assumptions, concepts, and research findings upon which an effective schools project is built; and reports that (1) effective schools research is applicable at all levels of a suburban school system, (2) vital dialogues have developed among building staffs engaged in this project, and (3) effective schools projects should follow a definite process, set forth in Appendix C. Sections 2 and 3 include numerous tables to illustrate changes in student achievement in five schools and to identify correlates of an effective school, as determined by teacher and administrator responses to the Connecticut School Interview (summarized in 27 pages of tables in Appendix E). Section 2, "Student Achievement," contains summary tables and comments and a disaggregated analysis of student achievement and concomitant goal data. Section 3, "Correlates of an Effective School," contains summary tables and comments, as well as activities pertinent to each correlate, and needs assessment data. (IW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273028

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert E. Sudlow
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SPENCERPORT CENTRAL SCHOOLS

Spencerport, New York

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS/TEACHING PROJECT

First Annual Report

October 1984

EA 018 762

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I Introduction. 1

SECTION II Student Achievement. 7

- Part A Summary Tables & Comments. 8
  - Conclusion. 9
  - Narrative. 11
- Part B Disaggregated Analyses of Student Achievement and Concomitant Goal Data. . . 16
  - Bernabi. 18
  - Munn. 20
  - Town Line. 22
  - Cosgrove. 24
  - Wilson. 31

SECTION III Correlates of An Effective School. 39

- Part A Summary Tables & Comments. 40
  - Conclusion. 41
  - Narrative. 42
- Part B Activities Pertinent to Each Correlate & Needs Assessment Data. 47
  - Bernabi. 48
  - Munn. .56
  - Town Line. 63
  - Cosgrove. 70
  - Wilson. 79

APPENDIX 86

- A. Report of the Leadership Planning Team & the Superintendent of Schools. 87
- B. Overview of More Effective Schools/Teaching Project. 100
- C. More Effective Schools/Teaching Project: Second Overview. 105
- D. Conducting An Effective Schools Program. 110

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX(continued)

E. Summary of Responses to the Connecticut School Interview, May 1983 and May 1984. . . 131

Bernabi. 132

Munn. 137

Town Line. 142

Cosgrove. 147

Wilson. 153

SECTION I

Introduction

During the 1982-83 school year the Spencerport Central School District embarked upon a comprehensive project to study the effective schools research and to see what implications it has at all levels of a suburban school system. The purpose of this report is to present a status (not evaluation) document summarizing findings at the end of the first full year of operation. Hopefully this report will stimulate all in the district to pause and reconsider what they are, and should be doing to improve their school. By looking at what has occurred, as seen through a different set of eyes, Building Planning Teams might generate new insights into how to reach the goal of effectiveness.

During the first year and a half of the project a number of documents were prepared. It is assumed that the reader has seen them and is familiar with them. In case he or she has not, or has misplaced a copy, Appendix C contains an order form. Briefly, these documents are:

Master Plan - Report of the Leadership Planning Team to the Superintendent. This report was approved by the Board of Education in May 1983.

First Overview of the Project - This bulletin is designed to be read immediately following Edmonds' article "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." It contains definitions of each of the correlates of effectiveness mentioned in Edmonds' concluding paragraphs. December 1983.

Second Overview of the Project - This bulletin sets forth the various steps in the project's design and development. July 1984.

Conducting An Effective Schools Program - This article discusses and operationally defines the differences between a generalized school improvement project and an effective schools project. June 1984.

It is important to recognize that this project could not have been successful without the many, many hours of thought and work given by each Building Planning Team. Their leadership was, and is, essential -- and gratefully appreciated. The members of the 1983-84 Building Planning Teams are:

Bernabi: John Berardicurti
Tony Marcello
Sheila Markman
Marilyn Burkey
Louise Sprecher, Principal

Building Planning Teams (continued)

Munn: Frank Cardella
Sue LaManque
Terry Dingee
Colleen Ridge
Matt Natalie, Principal

Town Line: Jim Alexander
Sally Henry
Linda Muir
Carole Jinks
Milton Ryan, Principal

Cosgrove: Richard Anderson
Terry Hedges
Eileen Piskacek
Nancy Jones
Robert Kincaid
Deanna Lammes
Ed Przybycien, Assistant Principal
Manuel Panarites, Principal

Wilson: Milton Danko
Joan Kuyon
Robert Nichol
Bonnie Seaburn
James Dentinger
Ross Constantino, Assistant Principal
Wilbur Selander, Principal

At the onset of the project a districtwide Leadership Planning Team was created. This group of key individuals received extensive inservice education from Ronald Edmonds and Larry Lezotte and developed a master plan for the project. The Plan was presented to the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education for approval and approved by them. A debt of gratitude must be given to those who served in this crucial role. They were:

Bernabi: John Berardicurti
Anthony Marcello

Munn: Frank Cardella
Sue LaManque

Town Line: Jim Alexander
Sally Henry

Cosgrove: Richard Anderson
Terry Hedges
Robert Kincaid

Wilson: Milton Danko
Joan Kuyon
Robert Nichol
Bonnie Seaburn

Districtwide Leadership Planning Team (continued)

Building Administration:

Louise Sprecher, Principal, Bernabi School
Matt Natalie, Principal, Munn School
Milton Ryan, Principal, Town Line School
Manuel Panarites, Principal, Cosgrove Junior High
Wilbur Selander, Principal, Wilson Senior High

District Office:

Frank Ferris, Testing and Evaluation
Robert Sudlow, Curriculum and Instruction

Resource Personnel:

Ronald Edmonds, Michigan State University
Larry Lezotte, Michigan State University

It also must be said that this project could not occur without the enthusiastic support of the Superintendent of Schools, Mr. Joseph Clement, Jr. and the Board of Education. The members of the 1983-84 Board of Education are:

Mrs. Gay Lenhard
Mr. Myron Fox
Mr. Larry Becker
Mrs. Beverly Brust
Mr. Burton Judd
Mr. Anthony Mazza, Jr./Mr. Elwood Noxon
Dr. Sam Rivoli

Most importantly, this project would have failed without the time, knowledge, wisdom and graciousness provided by its consultants -- Dr. Lawrence Lezotte and Mr. Ronald Edmonds of Michigan State University. Their willingness to give us their professional and family time is deeply appreciated.

They are interested to see if effective schools research is applicable in a suburban setting and to see what can be learned to help create a generalized staff development model.

We believe that so far several key observations have emerged:

1. The effective schools research is applicable at all levels of a suburban school system. At no time while we were implementing it have either major or minor questions been raised regarding its applicability to a suburban setting.

2. As a result of building staffs working on this project, dialogue has centered around key, crucial, important topics. For example, what can be healthier and more important than for a building to discuss, argue and decide its central mission! Or to face up to the possibility that it might not have high expectations that all students can learn!

3. There is a definite process which should be followed in an effective schools project. It is briefly set forth in the Second Overview. Spencerport is developing some materials which can be used at various junctures. Likewise so are projects in Connecticut, Jackson, Mississippi, Glendale, Arizona and elsewhere. Out of our collective efforts there well could emerge a synergism which could have a positive impact upon education in this nation.

Finally, it might be good at this juncture to pause and set forth once again the basic assumptions, concepts, research findings upon which an effective schools project is built. They were developed and unanimously agreed upon by the Leadership Planning Team as a part of the process of developing the district's master plan. They are:

1. Virtually all students are educable when educability is defined as pupil acquisition of basic school skills.

2. Research concludes that the school effects are more powerful than familial effects. This conclusion must not be taken to mean that there is no familial effect in pupil acquisition of academic skills. In some families background does not limit a student's ability to acquire basic school skills, but some families can enhance student achievement well beyond basic school skills.

3. a. Annually the goal of education for each youth is to bring him or her to at least the standard of minimum academic performance for that grade level so that he or she can perform successfully in the next grade level.

   b. Further, the goal of education is to prepare students so that they can make as many choices as possible. Thus upon graduation from high school all students would be able, as a result of their education, to choose whether or not to enter college, or to attend another form of post high school education, or to obtain a job.

4. There is a positive correlation between academic student achievement and staff expectations.

5. An emphasis upon learning, upon academic achievement, is the prime purpose of public education.

6. Teachers and principals can and do make a key difference in the quality of education each child receives.

7. A school building is a complex social system with a set of norms, beliefs and patterns of behavior which can facilitate or hinder learning.

8. Collaborative, cooperative, collegial, supportive, noncoercive planning especially at the building level and accompanied by support from District Office personnel is the key approach to improvement.

9. The building principal has a key role in establishing the climate of his or her building.

10. Change is a process, a series of related events. It is not one event.

11. Ideal change fosters ownership and commitment by all participants.

12. In many ways, the schools in this district are effective. The challenge is to make them more effective.

13. This project affects all school personnel.

14. Because the climate of a school is dependent upon all of its occupants, the individual school building as a whole is the strategic unit for planned change. To obtain change, attention must be paid to the culture of the school; focusing on the behavior of individual teachers or students is not sufficient.

15. Focusing on effective schools research may necessitate realignment of other priorities within the building.

Section II

Student Achievement

Part A

Summary Tables & Comments

Conclusion

The key project goal is the attainment of effectiveness. To ascertain this disaggregated analyses of student achievement are completed.

For Reading:

1. Improvement occurred in two elementary schools.
2. Partial improvement occurred in one elementary school.
3. Improvement did not occur in the junior high school.
4. The high school is effective for two consecutive years.

For Math:

1. Improvement occurred in one elementary school.
2. Partial improvement occurred in one elementary school and the junior high school.
3. Improvement did not occur in one elementary school.
4. The high school was effective the first year and almost effective the second year.

For the subject areas of social studies, science, writing, language, listening and English:

1. At Cosgrove improvement occurred only in Listening. Otherwise improvement did not occur.
2. Wilson was effective for two consecutive years -- this was most impressive!!

The project also has a Concomitant Goal directed towards above average student achievement. It should be noted that the Master Plan for the project calls only for the Concomitant Goal data to be monitored. Prime attention is to be devoted to attaining effectiveness.

Six measures of the Concomitant Goal indicated that it had been attained; twelve measures indicated that it had not been attained. However, this data analysis revealed that in twelve areas approximatley one-third to one-half of the students attained scores indicative of above average academic performance.

Narrative

This section of the report sets forth changes in student achievement which occurred during the first year of the project. It should be noted that at the end of the first year of a multi-year project it is not fair to state that any changes in achievement which occurred are directly related to the project. They may or may not have occurred in the absence of the project. However, as the project continues for the next three to five years and as people continue to both study the data and work to improve the correlates associated with an effective school, then it may be reasonable to infer that changes in achievement may be related to the project.

The basic goal of the project is:

> The instructional program in each building shall be effective. Effective is defined as the combination of all of the following:
>
> A. Ninety-five, or greater, percent of all the students at each grade level shall demonstrate minimum academic mastery. Children in Learning Disabilities classes shall be included in building analyses. The effect of the inclusion of the children on the total population shall be carefully monitored and analyzed.
>
> B. There shall be no significant difference in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.
>
> C. The above two conditions shall have been obtained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

This can be illustrated as follows:

	Low Socioeconomic Classes	Middle & Upper Socioeconomic Classes
At or above minimum academic mastery	≥95%	≥95%
Below minimum academic mastery	≤5%	≤5%

Should a school building not be effective according to the criteria of the Primary Goal (above) and its implementing Definitions (below) and Standards (below), then we recommend that the following definition of school improvement be used until the building attains effectiveness.

A. There shall be an annual increase in the proportion of students who demonstrate minimum academic mastery, and

B. There shall be an annual decrease in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.

The table below summarizes whether each building is progressing in reading and mathematics towards effectiveness:

	Reading	Math
Bernabi	improvement occurred	improvement occurred
Munn	partial improvement occurred	improvement did not occur
Town Line	improvement occurred	partial improvement occurred
Cosgrove	improvement did not occur	partial improvement occurred
Wilson	effective for two consecutive years	effective the first year near effectiveness the second year

The table below shows whether each secondary building is progressing in these subject areas towards effectiveness.

	Cosgrove Grades 7-8	Wilson Grades 9-12
Social Studies	improvement did not occur	effective two consecutive years
Science	improvement did not occur	effective the first year near effectiveness the second year
Writing	improvement did not occur	effective for two consecutive years
Language	improvement did not occur	-----
Listening	improvement occurred	
English	-----	effective for two consecutive years

Detailed data upon which the above conclusions are based appears in the later portion of this section.

Spencerport's project is unique in that it also has a Concomitant Goal addressed to excellent achievement. It is:

> Evaluations of ongoing school improvement projects shows that as overall achievement rises, outstanding individual achievement also rises. Therefore we recommend that the district monitor various indicators to see if the number of students with outstanding achievement rises. (It should be noted that the Leadership Planning Team strongly recommends that building plans center solely around achieving the Primary Goal.)

Below are the standards for monitoring the Concomitant Goal:

1. There shall be an annual evaluation of the percentage of students demonstrating *superior academic mastery as demonstrated* either by scoring in stanines seven, eight and nine on the Stanford Achievement Test or by scoring at or above 90% on a Regents exam.
2. For those subjects in which a significant percentage of the students take a Regents exam:
    a. A score of 65% or better
    b. An annual increase in the percentage of students taking the exam.

The table below summarizes whether or not each building met the Concomitant Goal for reading and mathematics:

	Reading	Math
Bernabi	not met	not met
Munn	met	not met
Town Line	met	met
Cosgrove	not met	met
Wilson	-----	not met

The table below shows whether the Concomitant Goal for other subject areas in the secondary schools was met.

	Cosgrove Grades 7-8	Wilson Grades 9-12
Social Studies	met	met
Science	not met	not met
Language	met	-----
Listening	not met	-----
English	-----	met

While developing the Concomitant Goal data it became very apparent that there are some very high percentages of students obtaining scores indicative of above average academic achievement. The data for reading and mathematics appear below.

Approximate Percentages of Students Scoring in the Top Three Stanines on the Stanford Achievement Test or 90-100 on a Regents Exam

	Reading	Mathematics
Bernabi	48%	56%
Munn	32%	50%
Town Line	44%	51%
Cosgrove	30%	40%
Wilson	-----	31%

NOTE: The national average for the elementary and junior high school levels is 23%.

Subject Area	Attainment of Goal
English	not met
Math	not met
Science	not met
Social Studies	not met

Part B

Disaggregated Analysis of Student Achievement
and
Concomitant Goal Data

Part B of Section II contains data for each building. Several comments need to be made.

1. The disaggregated analysis of student achievement is a summary of two extensive documents which were given to each building planning team -- one in the summer of 1983 and the other in the summer of 1984. The summary presented in this part of the report is intended to provide an overview, a photograph, of how well the students in each building achieved. All of the data for each subject area, such as math grades 1-6 or math grades 7-8, is collapsed into one table. If the reader wishes to know what occurred at specific grade levels, he or she should consult the individual reports.

2. Because of the centrality of the disaggregated analyses to the project's goal, prime attention should be devoted to them.

3. Explanations regarding how to interpret disaggregated analysis appear in the detailed reports sent to each building each year. For those who wish to go beyond the summary statements which appear in this part, the explanations appear in Appendix D.

4. Because we are dealing only with test scores for students for whom we have an indicator of socio-economic status and because the percentage of students for whom we have data differed (increased) between the first and second years of the project, numbers set forth in this report will not necessarily be the same as numbers in other documents. As best as we can determine, the students for whom we have socio-economic data are representative of the total population.

5. The data for the first aspect of the Concomitant Goal is based upon those students for whom we have socio-economic data. Data for the second aspect was taken from the district's annual Regents Exam Reports.

BERNABI

Reading Comprehension

Grades 1-6

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Mimimum Academic Mastery	86%	92%	89%	93%
Below Minimum Mastery	14%	8%	11%	7%

This table shows that improvement towards effectiveness occurred. The percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery, and the proportional discrepancy between lower SES* and middle and upper SES* students who scored below minimum mastery decreased.

*It should be noted that for Spencerport, as compared to the rest of the nation, "lower" is a relative term. For Spencerport it is those students whose mother had a high school education or less. Whereas as for the nation as a whole it could mean those whose parents had an eighth grade education or less. For more complete information on how this was determined for Spencerport, see Appendix D.

BERNABI

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Reading Comprehension-Grades 1-6

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	48.9%
--May 1984	46.6%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal of an annual increase in the percentage of students demonstrating above average academic mastery was not met. This table, however, also shows that almost half of the student body attains scores at this level.

BERNABI

Total Math

Grades 1-6

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	86%	93%	90%	95%
Below Minimum Mastery	14%	7%	10%	5%

This table shows that improvement towards effectiveness occurred. The percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery increased, and the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery decreased.

BERNABI

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Total Math-Grades 1-6

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	57.0%
--May 1984	55.0%

This table shows that he project's Concomitant Goal was not met. There was a decrease in the percentage of students scoring in the top three stanines. This table, however, also shows that over one-half of the students attain scores demonstrating above average academic mastery.

MUNN

Reading Comprehension

Grades 1-6

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	74%	76%	77%	83%
Below Minimum Mastery	26%	24%	23%	17%

This table shows that partial progress towards efffectiveness occurred. The percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery increased. However, the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery increased instead of decreasing.

MUNN

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Reading Comprehension-Grades 1-6

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	29.6%
--May 1984	33.6%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was met. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining scores demonstrating above average academic mastery. The table shows that one-third of the student body scores at this level.

MUNN

Total Math

Grades 1-6

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	85%	89%	82%	91%
Below Minimum Mastery	15%	11%	18%	9%

This table shows that progress toward effectiveness did not occur. The percentage of lower SES students demonstrating minimum academic mastery decreased, and the proportional discrepancy between lower and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery increased. It did not decrease.

MUNN

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Total Math-Grades 1-6

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	49.9%
--May 1984	49.2%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. There was no increase in the percentage of students scoring at this level. The table, however, shows that one-half of the student body attains scores demonstrating above average academic mastery.

TOWN LINE

Reading Comprehension

Grades 1-6

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	76%	88%	78%	89%
Below Minimum Mastery	24%	12%	22%	11%

This table shows that progress towards effectiveness occurred. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery, and the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery decreased.

TOWN LINE

Percentage of Students in Stainines 7-9
Reading Comprehension-Grades 1-6

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	42.5%
--May 1984	46.0%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was met. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery. It also shows that nearly one-half of the student body scores at this level.

TOWN LINE

Total Math

Grades 1-6

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	81%	92%	83%	94%
Below Minimum Mastery	19%	8%	17%	6%

This table shows that partial progress towards effectiveness occurred. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining minimal academic mastery, but there was no decrease in the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery.

TOWN LINE

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Total Math-Grades 1-6

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	49.1%
--May 1984	52.7%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was met. There was an increase in the percentage of attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery. It also shows that one-half of the student body scores at this level.

COSGROVE

Reading Comprehension

Grades 7-8

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	72%	80%	72%	83%
Below Minimum Mastery	18%	20%	18%	17%

This table shows that progress towards effectiveness did not occur. The percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery did not increase for both groups, and there was no decrease in the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Reading Comprehension-Grades 7-8

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	33.5%
--May 1984	27.2%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. There was no increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Language

Grades 7-8

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	80%	88%	78%	93%
Below Minimum Mastery	20%	12%	22%	7%

This table shows that progress towards effectiveness did not occur. The percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery did not increase for both groups, and there was a major increase in the proportional discrepancy between the lower SES and the middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Language-Grades 7-8

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	31.2%
--May 1984	35.6%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was met. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining scores demonstrating above average academic mastery. It also shows that approximatley one-third of the student body attains these scores.

COSGROVE

Listening

Grades 7-8

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	75%	83%	81%	83%
Below Minimum Mastery	25%	17%	19%	17%

This table shows that progress towards effectiveness occurred. There was an increase in the percentage of lower SES students who attained minimum academic mastery, and there was a decrease in the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Percentage of Students in Stainines 7-9
Listening-Grades 7-8

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	29.3%
--May 1984	27.0%

This table shows that the Concomitant Goal was not met. There was no increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Total Math

Grades 7-8

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	80%	88%	81%	94%
Below Minimum Mastery	20%	12%	19%	6%

This table shows partial progress towards effectiveness. An increased percentage of students scored above minimum academic mastery. There was, however, a major increase in the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who score below minimum academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Total Math-Grades 7-8

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	34.3%
--May 1984	45.8%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was met. It shows that there was an increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery. It also shows that over one-third of the student body attains these scores.

COSGROVE

Preliminary Regents Competency Test in Writing

Grade 8

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	88%	95%	88%	96%
Below Minimum Mastery	12%	5%	12%	4%

This table shows that progress towards effectiveness did not occur. The percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery did not increase for both groups, and there was an increase between the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who scored below minimum academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Science

Grade 8

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	86%	92%	75%	91%
Below Minimum Mastery	14%	8%	25%	9%

This table shows that progress towards effectiveness did not occur. There was a decrease in the percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery, and there was a major increase in the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who score below minimum academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9
Science-Grade 8

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	36.7%
--May 1984	26.4%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. There was no increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Social Studies

Grade 8

	May 1983		May 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	77%	86%	76%	92%
Below Minimum Mastery	23%	14%	24%	8%

This table shows that progress towards effectiveness did not occur. The percentage of students attaining minimum academic mastery did not increase for both groups, and there was a major increase in the proportional discrepancy between lower SES and middle and upper SES students who score below minimum academic mastery.

COSGROVE

Total Percentage of Students in Stanines 7-9 Social Studies-Grade 8

National Average	23.0%
--May 1983	32.5%
--May 1984	37.7%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was met. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery. It also shows that one-third of the student body scores at this level.

WILSON

English Regents Exam

Grade 11

	June 1983		June 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	92%	98%	97%	98%
Below Minimum Mastery	8%	2%	3%	2%

This table shows that effectiveness was attained for two years in a row!

WILSON

Percentage of Students Scoring 90-100 on the English Regents Exam

June 1983	10.6%
June 1984	15.6%

This table shows that the first aspect of the project's Concomitant Goal was met. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic achievement.

Percentage of Students Taking and Passing English Regents Exams

	June 1983	June 1984
Percent Passing	53%	47%
Percent Passing	95%	96%

This table shows that the second aspect of the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. Although the percentage passing increased there was a decrease in the precent of students taking the exam.

WILSON

Regents Competency Test in Reading

Grade 11

	June 1983		June 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	100%	100%	100%	100%
Below Minimum Mastery	0%	0%	0%	0%

This table shows that effectiveness was attained for two years in a row!

WILSON

Regents Competency Test in Writing

Grade 11

	June 1983		June 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	97%	100%	99%	100%
Below Minimum Mastery	3%	0%	1%	0%

This table shows that effectiveness was attained for two years in a row!

WILSON

Math*

Grades 9-11

	June 1983		June 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	96%	96%	90%	88%
Below Minimum Mastery	4%	4%	10%	12%

*Math 9 Regents Exam, Math 10 Regents Exam, Math 11 Regents Exam, Regents Competency Test in Mathematics

This table shows that effectiveness was attained in the first year. For the second year, if the percentages of students scoring below minimum academic mastery had been five percent or less, effectiveness would have been attained again.

WILSON

Percentage of Students Scoring 90-100
on Math 9, 10, 11 Regents Exams

June 1983 - 32.3%

June 1984 - 30.8%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. There was no increase in the percentage of students attaining scores demonstrating above average academic achievement. It, however, does show that over one-fourth of the math students score in this category.

WILSON

Percentage of Students Taking and Passing Math Regents Exams

	June 1983	June 1984
Math 9		
Percent taking	78%	71%
Percent passing	94	90
Math 10		
Percent taking	64%	58%
Percent passing	92	92
Math 11		
Percent taking	51%	54%
Percent passing	88	82

This table shows that the second aspect of the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. For both Math 9 and 10 the percent of students taking the exam decreased and the percent passing either decreased (Math 9) or remained the same (Math 10). For Math 11 the precent taking the exam increased but the percent passing it decreased.

WILSON

Science*

Grades 9-11

	June 1983		June 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	98%	94%	91%	93%
Below Minimum Mastery	2%	6%	9%	7%

*Earth Science Regents Exam, Biology Regents Exam, Chemistry Regents Exam

This table shows that effectiveness in the first year was met. For the second year, if the percentage of students scoring below minimum academic mastery had been five percent or less, effectiveness would have been attained again.

WILSON

Percentage of Students Who Score 90-100 On a Regents Exam

Science*

June 1983 - 24.1%

June 1984 - 24.7%

This table shows that the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. For all practical purposes the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery remained constant. It does show, however, that approximately one-fourth of the science students score in this category.

*Earth Science, Biology, Chemistry

WILSON

Percentage of Students Taking and Passing Science Regents Exams

	June 1983	June 1984
Earth Science		
Percent taking	57%	42%
Percent passing	96	97
Biology		
Percent taking	56%	49%
Percent passing	90	92
Chemistry		
Percent taking	30%	33%
Percent passing	91	81

This table shows that the second aspect of the project's Concomitant Goal was not met. For earth science and biology although the percentage of students passing the exam increased, there was--especially for earth science--a drop in the percent taking the exam. For chemistry, although the percent taking the exam increased, the percent passing decreased.

WILSON

Social Studies Regents Exam

Grade 11

	June 1983		June 1984	
	High School	Post High School	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	94%	93%	93%	95%
Below Minimum Mastery	6%	7%	7%	5%

This table shows that for all practical purposes effectiveness was attained for two years in a row!

WILSON

Percentage of Students Scoring 90-100 on the Social Studies Regents Exam

June 1983 - 8.9%

June 1984 - 15.7%

The project's Concomitant Goal was met. There was an increase in the percentage of students attaining scores indicating above average academic mastery.

Percentage of Students Taking and Passing the Social Studies Regents Exam

	June 1983	June 1984
Percent taking	61%	57%
Percent passing	89	92

This table shows that the second aspect of the Concomitant Goal was not met. The increase in the percent of students passing the exam was offset by the decrease in the percent taking it.

SECTION III

CORRELATES OF AN EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

Part A

Summary Tables & Comments

Conclusion

Teacher and administrator responses to the Connecticut School Interview indicate that there are a number of correlates which can be considered as areas of strength. The criteria for this determination is a response of two-thirds (66%) or more to items D & E (or A & B if the question is worded negatively) on the interview form.

The correlates which are an area of strength for each building are:

Bernabi

Safe and Orderly Environment
Clear School Mission
High Expectations
Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress
Home-School Relations

Munn

Clear School Mission
Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

Town Line

Safe and Orderly Environment
Clear School Mission
Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

Cosgrove

None

Wilson

None

Narrative

The major implication of the effective schools research is that student academic achievement can be improved by first addressing that complex social organization known as a school building. As a result of working to improve the instructional climate in a school, it is hypothesized that student achievement will improve. Further, it is hypothesized that when a school has all six correlates in place, then student achievement in that school will be effective. That is, all students will be learning at least to the level of minimum academic mastery.

Consequently school improvement efforts center around ascertaining which correlates need to be strengthened and then working to improve or increase the frequency of the behavior which comprise that correlate. Spencerport's effective schools program is organized according to this model.

During May 1983 the Connecticut School Interview form was given to every teacher and administrator. That summer Ronald Edmonds and Larry Lezotte prepared building profiles based upon the results of the survey. At the same time the district office personnel prepared disaggregated analyses of student achievement for each building.

With this data in hand, each building planning team that summer prepared a proposed plan of action. This proposal was submitted to their faculty for review, discussion and approval. The final draft of the plan was then submitted to the Superintendent of Schools for his approval.

Once this occurred numerous, far-reaching, time-consuming projects commenced in all buildings. The minutes which were generated, and the reports and supporting documentation which were generated are voluminous! They easily fill at least two large three ring notebooks! This section of the Annual Report attempts to summarize this vast quantity of data in auniform, succinct manner. It may be that for those who are close to the project at the building level, succinctness turned out to be a vast oversimplification which is not truly representative of the major activities and accomplishments. However, the constraints of both space and time indicated that an attempt had to be made. Each building planning team, if it so wishes, may suggest modifications. However, the summary cannot contain fewer sections than it currently has and it must not be longer than one page. Nor, for the sake of consistency across the buildings can the title of each section be changed; nor should the style be changed.

During 1983-84 major activities occurred in the following areas:

	Bernabi	Munn	Town Line	Cosgrove	Wilson
Safe and Orderly Environment	**	**	*	*	*
Clear School Mission	**	**	**	**	
Instructional Leadership	**	**	**	**	**
High Expectations	**	**	*	**	*
Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task	**	*	*		**
Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress	**				**
Home-School Relations	**			*	**

* Some activity

** Major activities

An analysis of the needs assessment data reveals that some correlates can be considered as areas of strength for a building. These areas of strength may have occurred prior to a school undertaking activities. (That is the May 1983 needs assessment indicated that they were an area of strength.) Or, they may have occurred as a result of activities during 1983-84. The table below shows which correlates are areas of strength in each building.

	Bernabi	Munn	Town Line	Cosgrove	Wilson
Safe and Orderly Environment	*		*		
Clear School Mission	*	*	*		
Instructional Leadership					
High Expectations	*				
Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task					
Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress	*	*	*		
Home-School Relations	*				

*Two-thirds or more of the respondents indicated that this correlate was an area of major strength.

Finally, the table below indicates the percentage of faculty and administrators in each building which indicated that the correlate was an area of strength in the building.

Percentage of Respondents Indicating that the Correlate is an Area of Major Strength

		Bernabi	Munn	Town Line	Cosgrove	Wilson
Safe and Orderly Environment	1983	81%	68%	66%	41%	31%
	1984	82	57	75	42	32
Clear School Mission	1983	61	62	61	51	34
	1984	84	66	72	56	34
Instructional Leadership	1983	44	34	34	34	34
	1984	54	36	41	40	34
High Expectations	1983	50	46	49	58	54
	1984	70	55	57	54	62
Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task	1983	45	42	39	64	67
	1984	45	38	44	62	65
Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress	1983	65	70	69	51	48
	1984	73	73	66	52	56
Home-School Relations	1983	43	52	53	39	30
	1984	67	58	58	47	32

Several conclusions can be drawn from the above table.

1. Improvements occurred as follows:

   Safe and Orderly Environment

      Town Line

   Clear School Mission

      Bernabi
      Munn
      Town Line
      Cosgrove

1. Improvements occurred as follows:(continued)

   Instructional Leadership

   - Bernabi
   - Town Line
   - Cosgrove

   High Expectations

   - Bernabi
   - Munn
   - Town Line
   - Wilson

   Opportunity to Learn and Student Time On Task

   - Town Line

   Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

   - Bernabi
   - Wilson

   Home-School Relations

   - Bernabi
   - Munn
   - Town Line
   - Cosgrove

2. Regression occurred as follows:

   Safe and Orderly Conduct

   - Munn

This data is reflected more fully in the readministration of the Connecticut School Interview during May and June of 1984. Like the preceding summer, the Building Planning Teams has this, plus other important data to use for analyzing the needs of their building and for developing appropriate plans for 1984-85 based upon them.

It will be fascinating to observe what happens this year and to ascertain what next spring's evaluation data reveals!

Part B

Activities Pertinent to Each Correlate

and

Needs Assessment Data

BERNABI

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "Bernabi is perceived as safe and secure and a school in which discipline is not a major problem...leadership should consider whether that minority of students perceived to be the chronic discipline problems can be addressed through some specific intervention."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A committee of teachers studied and worked on this issue.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

A. A document titled "Student Behavior" was developed for distribution and use in 1984-85.

B. A document on Procedures for Dealing with Serious Student Discipline Problems was developed.

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	1%	17%	81%		*
	1984	1	17	82		*

Note: An asterick is used to indicate an area of major concern or strength if two-thirds or more of the respondents so indicate.

BERNABI

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The Bernabi staff perceived the school as having specified objectives that exist at all grade levels and basic skill areas... [However,] several somewhat confusing and perplexing outcomes were reported, and they deserve further examination."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A committee developed a statement of the school's mission. This statement was reviewed and approved by the faculty, the Principal and the Superintendent.

III. Major Products, Accomplishment

> "In a safe, orderly and positive environment, where learning is valued and differences are accepted, each child will achieve mastery of basic skills and will develop and progress intellectually, socially, emotionally and physically as an individual."

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses	1983	15%	10%	61%		
for Correlate	1984	2	2	84		*

BERNABI

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

I. Results of the May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "According to the respondents' perceptions, the Bernabi School has a very clear, strong and centralized instructional leader in the person of the principal....Some fine tuning of the leadership pattern in the school should be considered as a formal part of the improvement plan."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. Special attention was given to the areas of reading and math.

B. Yearly plans by subject and unit were collected from each teacher.

C. Emphasis was placed upon the interpretation and use of standardized test results.

D. Report cards were collected and examined.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	30%	18%	44%		
	1984	23	18	54		

Major area of need identified in 1984 needs assessment - instructional leadership of teacher leaders

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

6. The school requires and reviews lesson plans favorably.
26. Teachers frequently seek instructional advice from the principal.
27. The principal periodically discusses instructional issues with the teachers.
29. The principal regularly reviews and interprets test results with faculty.
30. The principal frequently communicates to teachers their responsibility in relation to student achievement.

31. The principal regularly arranges or promotes staff development activities.
33. The principal and teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades.
35. Faculty meetings primarily deal with instructional issues.

BERNABI

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

I. Results of the May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The teacher expectation questions probably represent one of the areas that ought to be a high priority in sorting out the next steps for the school improvement process for the Bernabi staff."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. Student performance on the district's criterion referenced tests (CRT) in reading was analyzed.

B. Objective Analyses of student performance on the Stanford Achievement Test in the areas of reading, listening and math were reviewed and discussed with teachers.

C. Mrs. Sprecher and Mr. Marcello attended a workshop on Teacher Expectation and Student Achievement.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	17%	22%	50%		
for Correlate	1984	8	11	70		*

BERNABI

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK

I. Results of the May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "This area deserves further consideration by the leadership team."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. On Superintendent's Conference Day the staff studied different ways to implement compensatory programs within legal constraints.

B. A committee:

1. Studied the issue of pull-out programs.
2. Developed a recommended time allotment document for each subject area.

III. Major Products, Accomplishment

"Time Allotment for Basic Skills"

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses	1983	19%	20%	45%		
for Correlate	1984	19	16	45		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

50. Time allotments for each basic skill area are set by the principal and teachers and monitored periodically.

51. Basic skills instruction time is rarely affected by outside interruptions.

52. Pull-out programs supplement classroom instruction.

53. There are few student disruptions during class.

BERNABI

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

I. Results of the May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The major concern that seems to be apparent in this section of the profile pertains to the limited use of the test results in the aggregate as a basic curriculum evaluation, modification and adjustment."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Emphasis was placed upon the use of the criterion referenced tests in reading and piloting review tests in two units of mathematics.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	8%	16%	65%		
	1984	3	11	73		*

BERNABI

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

I. Results of the May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The Bernabi School Community Program is strong and receives active support from both the teachers and the parents of the students....Homework represents an area of possible concern that may deserve special attention by the team."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A committee formulated a homework policy for the school building.

III. Major Products, Accomplishment

"Leo Bernabi School - Homework Policy"

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses	1983	26%	22%	43%		
for Correlate	1984	11	12	67		*

MUNN

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

"71% of the respondents described the school as a safe and secure building where security is not an issue for either staff or students."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A committee developed a document dealing with:

rules for student behavior

procedures for serious discipline problems

parental form to indicate that the parent has discussed the school's discipline rules with his or her children

III. Major Products, Accomplishment

"Rules for Student Behavior"

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	7%	25%	68%		*
	1984	7	35	57		
School and class behavior are generally acceptable	1983	11	46	43		
	1984	23	53	20		

MUNN

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The leadership team ought to give some consideration to clarifying the existence of a written mission statement, fine tuning the presence of grade level and subject objectives, trying to ascertain whether they are present for all levels and in all areas, and that there are not too many of them such that it is unreasonable to expect teachers to hold all students to a level of minimum mastery on these objectives."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A committee developed a statement which was approved by the faculty, the Principal and the Superintendent.

III. Major Products, Accomplishment

> "The William C. Munn School's mission is to teach our children basic knowledges, understandings, useful skills and to foster positive values and attitudes which will prepare them for the next step in their education."

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	14%	16%	62%		
	1984	10	18	66		*

MUNN

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "There are specific identified behaviors that are seen not so much as weak, relative to instructional leadership, but as varying from teacher to teacher. Some additional thought and clarification and promotion of these leader behaviors in a more uniform way might be an important aspect of the instructional leadership and school improvement plan."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. The Principal initiated projects to more actively involve teacher leaders and grade level team leaders in the instructional program.

B. During the first semester inter-grade level meetings were held.

C. Teacher plan and grade books were reviewed periodically by the Principal.

D. The Principal met with each teacher regarding students with poor academic performance.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	40%	22%	34%		
	1984	33	29	36		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

19. Teacher leaders promote frequent discussion of instructional improvement.
24. The principal is regularly visible at various locations in the school.
25. The school requires and reviews lesson plans regularly.
29. The principal regularly reviews and interprets test results with faculty.
33. Faculty meetings primarily deal with instructional issues.

MUNN

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

"The Munn staff indicated a rather varied pattern with respect to the expectation that all students should master basic skills."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. The Principal met with teachers to discuss students scoring below the fortieth percentile on the Stanford Achievement Test and their instructional program.

B. A committee developed recommended ways to recognize individual students academic excellence.

III. Major Products, Accomplishment

Report on Efforts to Recognize Academic Excellence

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	14%	29%	46%		
for Correlate	1984	17	22	55		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

36. Ninety percent or higher of students are expected to master basic skills at each grade level.
37. Teachers believe they are responsible for students to master basic skills at their grade level.
38. Teachers believe that all students can master basic skills regardless of home background factors.
39. Teachers have high expectations that all students will learn.
40. The number of low income children retained in grades is proportionately equivalent to others retained.

MUNN

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The items...suggest that there is a substantial variability from classroom to classroom, and perhaps basic skill subject to basic skill subject. Some review and further coordination might prove to be very helpful in increasing achievement in the skill areas."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. Some questions on the needs assessment instrument were reworded to obtain better clarity. They were readministered to the staff.

III. Major Products, Accomplishment

The revised wording for the following questions was incorporated into the Needs Assessment Instrument for all elementary schools.

41 a. How much time is allocated for reading in your classroom?

b. How much time is allocated for language arts (excluding reading)?

42. How much time is spent in your class on math each day? (If you do not teach, mark Not Applicable.)

43. Describe how time allotments in basic skills are determined in this school.

47. For what percentage of time that is scheduled for basic skill instruction are students assigned independent seat work?

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	22%	27%	42%		
	1984	31	22	38		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

51. Basic skills instruction time is rarely affected by outside interruptions.

MUNN

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "Student progress is frequently monitored by the staff.... Teacher-made classroom tests and 'CRT' tests seem to be used as a basis for curriculum evaluation, as well as student evaluation. However, the annual standardized test does not appear to have a substantial influence on changes in the curriculum and instructional program."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Major attention was focused on other correlates.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	5%	13%	70%		*
for Correlate	1984	6	13	73		*

MUNN

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> [There should be]"some further discussion relative to a school-wide homework policy and a better standardization in the implementation of the policy."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Major attention was focused on other correlates.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	22%	23%	52%		
	1984	15	24	58		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

65. There is an active parent organization.
66. Parents are directly involved in supporting the school program.

TOWN LINE

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

"Town Line may be described as a school that is secure from outside interference but has some occasional incidents caused by a few students."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. The Principal held meetings with the Director of Buildings and Grounds, the building custodian and teachers.

B. A list of the daily cleaning responsibilities of classroom teachers and of custodians was developed and circulated.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

"Daily Room Cleaning Responsibilities"

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	6%	27%	66%		*
	1984	6	20	75		*

TOWN LINE

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The area of school mission focus and grade level objectives is an area that deserves some further study on the part of the leadership team."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A committee developed a statement of school mission which was approved by the faculty, the Principal and the Superintendent.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

> "Our mission at Town Line School is to provide a program in which we expect educational growth from each student within an orderly and caring environment."

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	13%	15%	61%		
for Correlate	1984	5	12	72		*

TOWN LINE

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "Three aspects of the instructional leadership deserve further consideration in the school improvement plan. First, the visibility and presence of the principal in the school, in contrast to being out of school for other meetings. Second, the extent to which grade level goals and objectives are articulated and encouraged as a basis for decision-making. Three, the extent to which the teachers and the staff in general feel a sense of accountability as would be expressed primarily through test results."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. The Principal made a major effort to be a persuasive physical presence throughout the building.

B. Major efforts were devoted to reviewing and using the reading criterion referenced tests.

C. Considerable attention was devoted to the K-6 math program.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

"Articulation of Grade Level Goals"

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	32%	27%	34%		
	1984	29	25	41		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

18. The principal promotes frequent discussion of instructional improvement.

29. The principal regularly reviews and interprets test results with the faculty.

30. The principal frequently communicates to teachers their responsibility in relation to achievement.

33. The principal and teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades.

TOWN LINE

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "It would appear that the general sense is that the teachers and administrators have concluded that mastery of basic school skills does not now, nor probably can not, extend to virtually 100% of the pupils in the school."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. Research findings were obtained and shared with staff.

B. A committee to develop a school-wide discipline plan was formed.

C. A committee to establish grade-level standards was formed.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

"Draft - Discipline - A total School Program"

"Disciplinary Referral Record"

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	13%	27%	49%		
for Correlate	1984	6	25	57		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

37. Teachers believe they are responsible for students to master basic skills at their grade level.
38. Teachers believe that all students can master basic skills regardless of home background factors.
39. Teachers have high expectations that all students will learn.
42. Discipline problems are spread across all categories of students, not just low achieving students.

TOWN LINE

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "When asked about general formats for instruction, especially in relation to seatwork, a variety of responses were given. Everything from seatwork representing a small and moderate amount of activity to independent seatwork as being a substantial part of the typical instructional day....The variety of instructional settings might profit from further study by the leadership team."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. Data was gathered on and discussion occurred on developing time allotments for reading and math instruction.

B. Teachers prepared instructional overviews for the year by month detailing units taught by subject.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	17%	26%	39%		
for Correlate	1984	22	17	44		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

51. Basic skills instruction is rarely affected by outside interruptions.

52. Pull-out programs supplement classroom instruction.

TOWN LINE

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "In general, the responses were very favorable and this particular area does not seem to warrant substantial effort or time from the leadership team in the forseeable future."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Major efforts were devoted to reviewing and using the reading criterion referenced tests.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	8%	11%	69%		*
	1984	4	17	66		*

TOWN LINE

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The major suggestion for improvement would be to extend the current patterns and practices to be inclusive of a larger proportion of the total parent community of the students from Town Line."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Major attention was devoted to the other correlates.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	20%	17%	53%		
	1984	15	17	58		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions.

65. There is an active parent organization.

67. A vast majority of parents attend scheduled parent-teacher conferences.

COSGROVE

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

"The preponderance of responses characterized the school as safe, orderly and well maintained."

II. 1983-84 Activities

The Building Advisory Committee initiated a process to review and study the issue of student discipline.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	17%	41%	41%		
	1984	9	49	42		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

4. The school building is clean and well taken care of by staff and students.

COSGROVE

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment Results

"There is general agreement that Cosgrove is characterized by a written set of instructional goals designed to guide the basic program of instruction in all core academic areas....What is wanted here is an increase in the proportion of staff aware of and responsive to school mission and goals."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A statement of the school's mission was developed by the Building Planning Team and approved by the faculty, the Principal and the Superintendent.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

"The mission of the Ada M. Cosgrove School is to assist students with the transition between the elementary and secondary years by teaching academic and practical skills and social responsibility as it pertains to the school setting."

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	22%	23%	51%		
for Correlate	1984	18	23	56		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

33. There is a written statement of purpose which guides the instructional program of this school.
35. School-wide objectives guide classroom instruction.
40. Materials and equipment needed most often to carry out instructional objectives are available.

COSGROVE

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "In sum, administrative attention to instructional issues is already a significant element in the life of the school."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. Semi-annual review and critique of each teacher's planbook.

B. Each teacher trained in content area reading (CAR) developed at least one unit based on this approach.

C. Teacher Leaders were oriented on how to interpret CAR testing data.

D. Interdisciplinary groups, dealing with instructional issues, involving both professional and support staffs, met monthly.

E. A series of inservice workshops on listening skills were presented to the total faculty.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

A. CAR unit plans

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses to Correlate	1983	34%	27%	34%		
	1984	35	33	40		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

8. Teacher Leaders promote frequent discussion of instructional improvement.
16. After a classroom observation the assistant principal provides feedback primarily on instructional issues.
17. The principal is regularly visible at various locations in the school.
18. The school requires and reviews lesson plans regularly.
21. Teachers frequently seek instructional advice from the assistant principal.

COSGROVE - INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP (Continued)

22. The principal regularly reviews and interprets test results with faculty.

23. The principal frequently communicates to teachers their responsibility in relation to student achievement.

25. The Teacher Leaders regularly arrange or promote staff development activities.

30. Faculty meetings deal primarily with instructional issues.

COSGROVE

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "Cosgrove is a school reported as adequately serving the academic needs of upwards of 75% of its students. School improvement at Cosgrove thus depends largely on improving the quality of teaching and learning for the 25% of Cosgrove students not now being academically served as well as they might."

II. 1983-84 Activities

- A. A homework policy was implemented.
- B. Parents were surveyed regarding their perceptions of the homework policy.
- C. A student remediation policy was implemented.
- D. A survey was done of students' perceptions of their teachers and classes.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

- A. Homework Policy
- B. "Student Academic Performance"
- C. Report on Parent Homework Policy Survey
- D. "Survey of Student Attitudes"
- E. Analysis of Survey of Student Attitudes

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	17%	23%	58%		
	1984	12	22	54		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

43. Teachers believe that all students can master basic skills regardless of home background factors.

44. Teachers have high expectations that all students will learn.

49. In my academic area initial instruction is to the whole class with follow-up instruction to small groups.

COSGROVE

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "These data describe a school with structured and productive classroom environments. While a significant majority (74%) reported that 85% or more of classroom instructional time was spent on structured learning activities, some staff reported substantially lower rates."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Major attention was devoted to other correlates.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlates	1983	9%	22%	64%		
	1984	9	24	62		

COSGROVE

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

I. Review of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "There is substantial interaction in Cosgrove between testing and program evaluation....It appears that for significant subsets of students, measured achievement is not used to evaluate and adjust the instructional program."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Major attention was devoted to other correlates.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	25%	12%	51%		
	1984	26	11	52		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following question:

63. Individual teachers use CRT's to check student mastery and to plan the next instructional sequence for their group.

COSGROVE

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

I. Review of May 1984 Needs Assessment Results

> "By and large these data describe a school with amicable and cooperative home/school relations."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A building-wide parents' organization was formed.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	38%	18%	39%		
for Correlate	1984	30	16	47		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

65. Parents are directly involved in supporting the school program.
69. The school has a written policy on homework, and homework is regularly assigned to all students.
70. Most parents accept and understand their role in monitoring homework.

WILSON

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

I. .Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "Wilson could be characterized as a safe and orderly environment."

II. 1983-94 Activities

The consistency with which administrators handled disciplinary referrals and the overall disciplinary process were studied.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

A. The disciplinary sections of the student and teacher handbooks were written during the summer of 1984.

B. "High School Discipline Policy Codification"

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	11%	57%	31%		
	1984	9	59	32		

WILSON

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

"Wilson...seems to have a clear school mission."

II. 1983-84 Activities

See Opportunity to Learn and Student Time On Task

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses for Correlate	1983	41%	22%	34%		
	1984	42	23	34		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

19. The principal or assistant principal regularly arranges or promotes staff development activities.

WILSON

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "While there do not appear to be serious instructional leadership issues associated with the Wilson High School, there are many areas, according to the responses, where further clarification, consistency and coordination would provide a much more uniform leadership pattern throughout the school and all of its disciplines."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. The Building Planning Committee, in cooperation with the administration and the faculty, carefully reviewed the roles of the administrators and teacher leaders.

III. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses	1983	41%	22%	34%		
for Correlate	1984	42	23	34		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

12. After a classroom observation the principal or assistant principal provides feedback primarily on instructional issues.

13. The principal or assistant principal is regularly visible at various locations in the school.

18. The principal or assistant principal frequently communicates to teachers their responsibility in relation to student achievement.

19. The principal or assistant principal regularly arranges or promotes staff development activities.

WILSON

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The school seems to suggest, by its profile, that there [are] high expectations, that most students are expected to master basic skills, to be successful in school, and ultimately to graduate from high school."

II. 1983-84 Activities

Mr. Groszewski was asked to prepare a summary of research in this area.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

"Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement" was the topic of a faculty meeting.

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses	1983	19%	20%	54%		
for Correlate	1984	16	18	62		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

36. Teachers believe that all students can master basic skills regardless of home background factors.

38. The number of low income children retained in classes in my academic area is proportionately equivalent to others retained.

39. Almost all students in this school can be expected to complete high school.

WILSON

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The opportunity to learn and student time on task seem to be a strong area in each of the disciplines at Wilson."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A committee studied the issue of class interruptions and made recommendations.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

Report of the Time-On-Task Sub-Committee

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

					Area of Major	
		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Concern	Strength
Average Responses	1983	9%	17%	67%		*
for Correlate	1984	9	24	65		

WILSON

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "The implication from this might be that some thought ought to be given, especially in those areas where no testing now occurs, to the establishment of at least a minimum skills, minimum mastery criterion-referenced program. It would bring focus to the area and would indicate, by illustration, that the school expects students to master and become proficient in all subjects."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. The Building Planning Committee investigated and concluded that CRT's are a goal the building should pursue.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

A. An inservice workshop on developing skill objectives occurred in the last week of June, after the close of school.

B. Summer curriculum time was granted to high school teachers to write skill objectives for their courses.

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses	1983	24%	9%	48%		
for Correlate	1984	25	12	56		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

51. The standardized tests used in this school are a valid measure of the curriculum in my academic area.

55. There is a criterion-referenced testing program in my academic area.

56. Individual teachers use CRT's to check student mastery and to plan the next isntructional sequence for their group.

WILSON

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

I. Results of May 1983 Needs Assessment

> "It would seem that while things are comfortable, additional support and community involvement could help strengthen the teacher's ability to increase the levels of mastery across all subject areas in the school."

II. 1983-84 Activities

A. Parents and teachers were surveyed to see if they desired a parent organization.

B. A homework policy committee composed of parents, students and teachers was formed.

III. Major Products, Accomplishments

Homework Policy

IV. Results of May 1984 Needs Assessment

		Concern	Neutral	Strength	Area of Major Concern	Area of Major Strength
Average Responses	1983	45%	17%	30%		
for Correlate	1984	48	18	32		

Significant improvement occurred in teacher responses to the following questions:

62. The school has a written policy on homework, and homework is regularly assigned to all pupils.

APPENDIX

SPENCERPORT CENTRAL SCHOOLS
SPENCERPORT, NEW YORK

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS/TEACHING PROJECT
REPORT OF THE LEADERSHIP PLANNING TEAM
TO THE
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

JUNE 13, 1983

INTRODUCTION

In January, 1983 the Board of Education approved a project whereby the school district would investigate recent research on the characteristics of effective schools and of effective teaching. This project would be done in cooperation with the Institute of Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University.

One aspect of this project was the formation of a Leadership Planning Team consisting of key personnel from throughout the school system. Its purpose is "to develop a detailed plan of action for the entire school system. On the last day of the workshop, the team would present a proposed model which the Superintendent would either approve, accept in part, or reject. If the Superintendent either rejects the model or accepts it in part, the Team must revise it and present it again to the Superintendent for approval."

In order to fulfill its task, the Team met three times: March 28, 29, and April 19. The first two meetings were, in effect, an intensive seminar conducted by Dr. Ronald Edmonds and Dr. Larry Lezotte from Michigan State University. As a part of their presentation they gave the Team thirty-three articles to read. The April 19 meeting was a combination of further inservice education led by Drs. Lezotte and Edmonds, plus preliminary planning for this report.

In addition to the intensive seminar presented to the Leadership Planning Team, workshops of various intensity were conducted for principals, the Administrative Council, the Curriculum Council, the STAExecutive Commitee and the Board of Education. Further, a full-day workshop was held for all teachers and administrators in May, 1983.

This report then is presented to the Superintendent of Schools by the Leadership Planning Team to fulfill its responsibilities as outlined above.

LEADERSHIP PLANNING TEAM

1982-83

Bernabi

John Berardicurti	Grade 5	Teacher Leader, Health
Tony Marcello	Grade 5	Team Leader

Munn

Frank Cardella	Grade 1	Teacher Leader, Math
Sue LaManque	Grade 2	Teacher Leader, Soc. Studies

Town Line

Jim Alexander	Grade 6	Teacher Leader, Science
Sally Henry	Grade 3	Teacher Leader, Math

Cosgrove

Dick Anderson		Teacher Leader, Science
Terry Hedges		Teacher Leader, English
Bob Kincaid		Teacher Leader, Math

Wilson

Milt Danko		Teacher Leader, Math
Joan Kuyon		Teacher Leader, Home Ec
Bob Nichol		Teacher Leader, Math
Bonnie Seaburn		Teacher Leader, Guidance

STA

Deanna Lammes	Jr. High	Foreign Language

Building Administration

Louise Sprecher		Principal, Bernabi School
Matt Natalie		Principal, Munn School
Milt Ryan		Principal, Town Line School
Manuel Panarites		Principal, Cosgrove Jr. High
Bill Selander		Principal, Wilson Sr. High

District Office

Frank Ferris		Testing & Evaluation
Bob Sudlow		Curriculum & Instruction

Resource Personnel

Ronald Edmonds		Michigan State University
Larry Lezotte		Michigan State University

PROJECT GOAL

We recommend that the following primary goal be adopted for each building (Bernabi, Munn, Town Line, Cosgrove and Wilson/Trowbridge) in the Spencerport Central School District:

The instructional program in each building shall be effective. Effective is defined as the combination of all of the following:

A. Ninety-five, or greater, percent of all the students at each grade level shall demonstrate minimum academic mastery. Children in Learning Disabilities classes shall be included in building analyses. The effect of the inclusion of the children on the total population shall be carefully monitored and analyzed.

B. There shall be no significant difference in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.

C. The above two conditions shall have been obtained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

Should a school building not be effective according to the criteria of the Primary Goal (above) and its implementing Definitions (below) and Standards (below), then we recommend that the following definition of school improvement be used until the building attains effectiveness.

A. There shall be an annual increase in the proportion of students who demonstrate minimum academic mastery, and

B. There shall be an annual decrease in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.

CONCOMITANT GOAL

Evaluations of ongoing school improvement projects shows that as overall achievement rises, outstanding individual achievement also rises. Therefore we recommend that the district monitor various indicators to see if the number of students with outstanding achievement rises. (It should be noted that the Leadership Planning Team strongly recommends that building plans center solely around achieving the Primary Goal.)

PRIORITIES

In order to emphasize that the instructional program is aimed primarily at the intellectual domain and in order to reemphasize the priorities that this school district cares most about, we recommend that the Board of Education reaffirm the rank order priority for the four basic purposes of education, namely:

A. Intellectual Dimension
B. Social Dimension
C. Personal Dimension
D. Productive Dimension

DEFINITIONS

In order to implement the Primary Goal, we recommend that the following definitions be approved:

A. Minimum Academic Mastery--Students who achieve this have been prepared so that they will be predictably successful in the next grade either in this or in any other school district throughout the nation. Minimum academic mastery shall be measured by performance on a standardized achievement (norm or criterion referenced) test. The cut-off point between minimum and unsuccessful academic mastery shall be established in advance.

B. Socio-economic class is determined by the number of years of formal education which the mother of a child has. If the level of the mother's formal education is not available, then the level of the father's formal education will be used. Should a child not be living with his or her parents, then the number of years of formal education which the female (or the male) has in the household in which the child is residing shall be used.

STANDARDS FOR MONITORING
THE MINIMUM ACADEMIC
MASTERY GOAL

Because the district is for the first time administering in May, 1983 the 1982 editions of the Stanford Achievement Test, there is no local trend line data upon which to base the following recommendation. Accordingly the perceptions of the Leadership Planning Team, reading directors and of educational researchers in Monroe County were sought regarding which percentile would indicate acquisition of enough skills so that a student would do well in the next grade level. Also, student performance on several related standardized tests were examined. It was found that:

A. Approximately sixteen percent of the students in 1980-81 in grades 1-12 who took the Iowa Silent Reading Test or the Metropolitan Achievement Test in reading scored below the 40th percentile. In 1981-82 it was ten percent.

B. Approximately twenty-two percent of the tenth graders who took the Stanford Achievement Test in reading October, 1982 scored below the 40th percentile.

Accordingly the Team recommends that for grades K-8, minimum academic mastery shall be set at the fortieth percentile, that is stanine five, on the Stanford Achievement Test. Since the fortieth percentile is an interim cut-off point, it will be reexamined in 1983-84.

The specific tests to be used and the cut-off points for each are listed below.

1. For grades 1-6: Reading Comprehension and Total Math Scores--40th percentile.
2. For grades 7-8:
    a. Seventh grade--reading comprehension, language, total listening, total math--40th percentile.
    b. Eighth grade
        (1) Reading comprehension, total math, total listening, language, science, social studies--40th percentile.
        (2) New York State Preliminary Competency Test in Writing--Statewide Reference Point.
3. For grades 9-12:
    a. Areas in which 100% of all of the students at a grade level take a test.
        (1) Ninth grade math
            (a) Math 9 Regents Exam--65%
            (b) Math 10 Regents Exam--65%
            (c) New York State Math Regents Competency Test--65%
        (2) Tenth Grade
            Stanford Task II Test
            (a) October 1982 - total reading--40th percentile.
            (b) Starting October 1983 - total reading and total math--40th percentile.

(3) Eleventh Grade English
    (a) Comprehensive English Regents Exam--65%
    (b) Reading Regents Competency Test--Statewide Reference Point
    (c) Writing Regents Competency Test--65%

STANDARDS FOR MONITORING THE CONCOMITANT GOAL

The team recommends the following standards:

1. There shall be an annual evaluation of the percentage of students demonstrating superior academic mastery as demonstrated either by scoring in stanines seven, eight and nine on the Stanford Achievement Test or by scoring at or above 90% on a Regents exam.
2. For those subjects in which a significant percentage of the students take a Regents exam:
    a. A score of 65% or better
    b. An annual increase in the percentage of students taking the exam.

ASSUMPTIONS

The effective schools/teaching literature and/or the district's consultants have identified a number of assumptions upon which effective schools/teaching rest. In order for the Spencerport project to be successful, these assumptions need to be identified and accepted as a formal part of this project. We recommend that the following assumptions be approved:

1. Virtually all students are educable when educability is defined as pupil acquisition of basic school skills.
2. Research concludes that the school effects are more powerful than familial effects. This conclusion must not be taken to mean that there is no familial effect in pupil acquisition of academic skills. In some families, background does not limit a student's ability to acquire basic school skills; but some families can enhance student achievement well beyond basic school skills.

3. a. Annually the goal of education for each youth is to bring him or her to at least the standard of minimum academic performance for that grade level so that he or she can perform successfully in the next grade level.
   b. Further, the goal of education is to prepare students so that they can make as many choices as possible. Thus upon graduation from high school all students should be able, as a result of their education, to choose whether or not to enter college, or to attend another form of post high school education, or to obtain a job.
4. There is a positive correlation between academic student achievement and staff expectations.
5. An emphasis upon learning, upon academic achievement, is the prime purpose of public education.
6. Teachers and principals can and do make a key difference in the quality of education each child receives.
7. A school building is a complex social system with a set of norms, beliefs and patterns of behavior which can facilitate or hinder learning.
8. Collaborative, cooperative, collegial, supportive, non-coercive planning especially at the building level and accompanied by support from District Office personnel is the key approach to improvement.
9. The building principal has a key role in establishing the climate of his or her building.
10. Change is a process, a series of related events. It is not one event.
11. Ideal change fosters ownership and commitment by all participants.
12. In many ways, the schools in this district are effective. The challenge is to make them more effective.
13. This project affects all school personnel.

14. Because the climate of a school is dependent upon all of its occupants, the individual school building as a whole is the strategic unit for planned change. To obtain change, attention must be paid to the culture of the school; focusing on the behavior of individual teachers or students is not sufficient.
15. Focusing on effective schools research may necessitate realignment of other priorities within the building.

CHANGE MODEL

So that each school building can efficiently and effectively study itself and, if needed, make appropriate changes, we recommend that the following model be used:

I. School Building Needs Assessment
   A. Achievement Profile--A disaggregate analysis shall be done for each subject identified in "Standards for Monitoring the Minimum Academic Mastery Goal" above. A disaggregate analysis is a comparison of the percent of students from the lower socio-economic class who score at or below the minimum standard for academic mastery.
   B. School Profile--The results of the Connecticut Instrument which were given to all teachers, principals and assistant principals on May 20, 1983.

II. School Planning Committee
   A. A Planning Committee shall be formed in each building. It shall be broadly representative of the total faculty. It shall consist of the building principal, the current members of the Leadership Planning Team from that building, and:
      1. K-6 -- two additional teachers
      2. 7-8 -- two additional teachers and an assistant principal
      3. 9-12 —one additional teacher and an assistant principal

B. The functions of the School Planning Committee shall

1. To develop a plan for the building based upon the needs assessment data. This plan shall emphasize strengths and areas of needed improvement.
2. To identify and agree upon the most important needs and subsequent objectives.
3. a. To develop an appropriate written plan of action for the school year unique to the school's needs.
   b. Insofar as possible this plan shall be based upon programs and/or practices which current research literature has shown to be effective; namely they produce increases in student achievement.
   c. To have available support consulting assistance and specific journals, models and examples of strategies which work.
4. To share this plan of action with the total faculty on September 7, 1983 for the purposes of study, discussion and change before adopting a final plan of action by October 1, 1983. In order to properly do this, the Team recommends that there be a half-day of school on September 7, 1983.
5. To establish specific vehicles for both formal and informal ongoing communication with the faculty so that its deliberations are, and are perceived as, open.
6. To establish regular opportunities for input and review throughout the school year.
7. To meet periodically throughout the year to monitor and to facilitate the implementation of the plan.
8. To prepare a new plan for the second and future years based upon the annual evaluation of the building plan.

III. School Building Plan

  A. We recommend:

    1. That each Building Planning Committee meet this summer and develop a prioritized draft plan to present to the faculty upon the opening of school.
    2. That as soon as the draft plan is written this summer that it be sent to Drs. Lezotte and Edmonds for review.
    3. That after the faculty has had an opportunity to review the draft plan and suggest changes, the subsequent draft be sent to Drs. Edmonds and Lezotte for review.
    4. Then the School Planning Committee shall officially approve the plan for 1983-84 and forward it to the Superintendent of Schools for final review and approval. This must be forwarded to the Superintendent by no later than October 1, 1983.

  B. Any plan of action developed to become an effective school shall seek to modify only those things which are under the control of the building.

IV. Implementation of the Plan

This shall consist of steps 5, 6 and 7 under item II. B. immediately above, plus other appropriate activities.

V. On-Going Pupil Assessment

Specific procedures shall be established by the principal and faculty to monitor throughout the year the academic progress of students.

VI. Annual Evaluation

This shall consist first and primarily of the computation of a new disaggregate analysis of academic achievement, second of a readministration of the Connecticut Survey Instrument, and third of other appropriate activities. The School Planning Team shall develop a written evaluation report identifying needs, strengths and areas of improvement.

VII. The Next Year

Using the Annual Evaluation Report, the School Planning Committee shall develop a plan of action for the coming year using the same procedures and processes as it used for the current year.

CONCLUSION

For 1983-84 the District's Leadership Planning Team recommends:

1. That each school building develop and implement a plan of action. Note: Should the disaggregate analysis show that a school building is effective, this recommendation shall not apply.
2. That funds be provided for each Building Planning Team to meet this summer.
3. That there be a half day of school on September 8, 1983 for each Building Planning Team to present its preliminary plan to the faculty.
4. That once finally approved by the Superintendent of Schools, the individual school plans be implemented.
5. That funds be provided for Drs. Lezotte and Edmonds to meet and work with the Leadership Planning Team for one day in October and May, for two other days, if needed, and for periodic written and telephone consultations throughout the year.
6. That plans for the March Superintendent's Conference Day not be made until January, 1984. By that time the Leadership Planning Team will be in a better position to recommend whether all, some, or none of the day should be devoted to the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project.
7. That all of the recommendations in the preceding sections of this report be approved.
8. That necessary resources be provided in order to help buildings implement their plans.

APPENDIX B

OVERVIEW OF MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS/TEACHING PROJECT

SPENCERPORT CENTRAL SCHOOLS
Spencerport, New York 14559

First, it is important to define an effective school. The criteria which Mr.Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte used in their research to identify an effective school are:

A. Ninety-five, or greater, per cent of all the students at each grade level should demonstrate minimum academic mastery. Students who achieve minimum academic mastery have been prepared so that they will be predictably successful in the next grade in either their own school district or in any other school district throughout the nation. Minimum academic mastery is measured by performance on a standardized achievement test (preferably criterion-referenced, otherwise norm-referenced).

B. There shall be no significant difference in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socioeconomic class.

C. The above two conditions shall have been obtained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

This definition can be illustrated as follows:

	Low Socioeconomic Classes	Middle & Upper Socioeconomic Classes
At or above minimum academic mastery	≧95%	≧95%
Below minimum academic mastery	≦5%	≦5%

In terms of discourse at the national and state levels, this definition provides both for equity for children from all socioeconomic classes (which has a much higher correlation with achievement than does race) and for excellence.

This definition counters prevailing conventional wisdom stemming from the work of Coleman, Jencks, et. al., that family background is so important that schools can have little, if any, impact upon the educational achievement of youth.

For if family background were causal, then there would be no effective school building in the nation which had at least fifteen per cent of the student body from the low socioeconomic class. To test this hypothesis Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte examined the achievement and socioeconomic data for all the elementary schools in the major urban areas of the northeastern United States. They found a significant impact upon the educational achievement of their students. If the position of Coleman et. al. were true, not even one school would have been discovered.[1]

In order to ascertain the characteristics which distinguished the schools they discovered from other schools, trained blind observers were sent into these fifty-five other schools which were paired on as many basic demographic data as possible, e.g., racial composition of the student body, etc. These observers looked for approximately 175 characteristics derived from the literature and from research which are considered to be associated with student achievement. They found six characteristics which were in the effective schools but were not present in the paired schools. They are:[2]

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

   There is an orderly purposeful atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm for both students and staff. However, the atmosphere is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

2. Clear School Mission

   There is a clearly-articulated mission for the school through which the staff shares an understanding of and a commitment to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures and accountability.

3. Instructional Leadership

   The principal acts as the instructional leader who effectively communicates the mission of the school to the staff, parents and students and who understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program of the school.

4. High Expectations

   The school displays a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that students can attain mastery of basic skills and that they (the staff) have the capability to help students achieve such mastery.

5. Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task

   Teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in basic skill areas. For a high percentage of that allocated time students are engaged in planned learning activities directly related to identified objectives.

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

   Feedback on student academic progress is frequently obtained. Multiple assessment methods such as teacher-made tests, samples of students' work, mastery skills checklists, criterion-referenced tests and norm-referenced tests are used. The results of testing are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

It should be noted that the above findings are correlational, not causal, in nature. Hence, they are not in rank order and all must be present in order to move a school building from "ineffective" (as measured by the definition) to effective.

What is most significant is that the findings of this research, done primarily under the leadership of Ronald Edmonds while he was at Harvard, are very similar to the findings of Brookover et. al. at Michigan State, to the findings of Rutter et. al. in England. (The ASCD videotape on Teacher and School Effectiveness presents an excellent overview of this research.) Thus there is an emerging converging body of independent research findings which can be used to provide direction, focus, and thrust for analysis and improvement of instructional programs. By asking people to talk about such characteristics as clear school mission, high expectations, etc. they will be talking about and working on significant concepts central to the instructional purpose of public education.

Spencerport, to the best of our knowledge, is the first school system in the nation to explore the feasibility of implementing the effective schools research district-wide. Most districts apply it to some, not all, buildings--usually elementary schools. The first basic problem which we faced was to acquaint various key groups with the research and its implications, and to gain initial acceptance of these ideas. We did this as follows:

1. During the 1982-83 school year, an awareness session was held with each building, the Administrative Council, and the Board of Education using the ASCD videotape on Teacher and School Effectiveness. These sessions were conducted either by the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction or the Superintendent of Schools.

2. Half-day sessions orienting people to the research and its implications were held with the following groups:

   Board of Education
   Administrative Council
   Curriculum Council
   Teacher Union Executive Committee

   These sessions were led by Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte.

3. In-depth reviews of the research and implications were provided to the following:

   -Principals and Assistant Principals -- 1½ days

   -Leadership Planning Team -- 2 days
   (This is a district-wide steering committee for the project.)

   These sessions were led by Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte.

Following this, the district-wide Leadership Planning Teams developed an action plan. Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte told us that they regard it as an outstanding operational statement of the research and its implications. The Board of Education unanimously approved this plan on June 21, 1983.

The next major aspect of our project was to conduct a needs assessment to ascertain whether or not each building is effective, according to the definition, and whether it possessed each of the six characteristics of an effective school. We did this as follows:

1. In May, all staff members completed the Connecticut School School Interview. This is a school effectiveness needs assessment instrument developed by the Connecticut State Department of Education after carefully studying the work in New York City. We also, with the help of Mr. Edmonds, developed a secondary version of this instrument. To the best of our knowledge, this is the only school effectiveness instrument designed for secondary schools.

2. During the summer, Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte analyzed the data and prepared summary reports.

3. During the late summer Building Planning Teams, using the results of the needs assessment and the school profile prepared by Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte, developed proposed action plans. They then submitted these plans to their faculty for review, dialogue, and consensus before submitting them to the Superintendent of Schools for approval.

4. The various buildings are starting to implement their plan. It is too early to determine whether this first year's efforts, of a multi-year project, will be successful.

It is fascinating to observe individual teachers, teams, and faculties talking about important issues stemming from the research and from the building needs assessment results. For example, several buildings are trying to determine whether they do have a clear sense of mission which all adults in the building understand. Another building is upset over the finding that they may not have high expectations for all students. The primary teachers proposed that the report card be changed to better reflect the research.

5. In the late spring or early summer of each year, each building planning team will evaluate its activities using formal evaluation procedures and submit a report of findings and recommendations for the next year's activities to the Superintendent of Schools. The prime evaluation tools will be the disaggregated analysis of students' achievement and the Connecticut School Interview instrument which ascertains the degree to which each characteristic of an effective school is present in a building. Other evaluation tools which are part of a building plan also will be used.

Footnotes

[1] Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, October 1979, 15-24.

[2] Robert M. Villanova, The Connecticut School Interview, Hartford, Conn: Connecticut State Education Department, 1982.

A.more complete discussion of these correlates can be found in:

William J. Ganthier, Jr., Instructionally Effective Schools: A Model and A Process, Hartford, Conn: Connecticut State Education Department, 1983, 6-7.

The Effective School Report: From Research Into Practice, November 1983, 3-4.

©1984

Spencerport Central Schools

Spencerport, New York 14559

MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS/TEACHING PROJECT

Second Overview, July 1984

The Spencerport Project is unique for several reasons.

1. It is being conducted in a small (3,351 K-12 students) suburban school district. Parts of the district are semi-rural in nature.

2. It is a middle class school district with approximately ninety-seven percent of the students Caucasian.

3. All schools in the district are involved; namely, three elementary schools, a junior high school and a senior high school.

4. There is a strong district office commitment to helping the project be successful in each building.

5. a. Student achievement is good. Median scores on the Stanford Achievement Test ran in the sixtieth percentile. Similar scores are attained on other standardized tests.

   b. Parent satisfaction with the educational program is high.

   c. The main reason for embarking on this project is to see if significant research conducted in inner city schools could be used to further improve the quality of education in Spencerport.

6. Spencerport is a low-wealth school district. Of the eighteen school districts in Monroe County (Rochester, New York area), it ranks seventeenth or eighteenth in per pupil expenditures. Yet the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project has no outside federal aid, special state aid or foundation support. It is funded totally by the local budget.

7. The Project has a stringent academic achievement goal. It is:

   The instructional program in each building shall be effective. Effective is defined as the combination of all of the following:

   a. Ninety-five, or greater, percent of all students at each grade level shall demonstrate minimum academic mastery. Children in Learning Disabilities classes shall be included in building analyses. The effect of the inclusion of the children on the total population shall be carefully monitored and analyzed.

   b. There shall be no significant difference in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.

   c. The above two conditions shall have been obtained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

   Should a school building not be effective according to the criteria of a Primary Goal, then we recommend that the following definition of school improvement be used until the building attains effectiveness.

   a. There shall be an annual increase in the proportion of students who demonstrate minimum academic mastery,

      and

   b. There shall be an annual decrease in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socio-economic class.

8. In addition to concentrating on students with educational achievement, the Project has a Concomitant Goal for those who do well. It is:

   a. There shall be an annual evaluation of the percentage of students demonstrating superior academic mastery as demonstrated either by scoring in stanines seven, eight and nine on the Stanford Achivement Test or by scoring at or above 90% on a Regents exam.

8. b. For those subjects in which a significant percentage of the students take a Regents exam:

   1. An annual increase in the percentage of students scoring 65% or better.

   2. An annual increase in the percentage of students taking the exam.

9. The Master Plan for the Project sets forth fifteen assumptions on which effective schools/teaching rest. These statements were approved by an unanimous vote of the Leadership Planning Team.

This project was, and is being, implemented in the following manner:

Awareness Stage

1. During the 1982-83 school year, an awareness session was held with each building, the Administrative Council, and the Board of Education using the ASCD videotape on Teacher and School Effectiveness. These sessions were conducted either by the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction or the Superintendent of Schools.

2. Half-day sessions orienting people to the research and its implications were held with the following groups:

   Board of Education
   Administrative Council
   Curriculum Council
   Teacher Union Executive Committee

Inservice Stage

In-depth reviews of the research and its implications were provided to the following:

-Principals and Assistant Principals -- 1½ days

-Leadership Planning Team -- 2 days
(This is a district-wide steering committee composed of key teachers and principals.)

These sessions were led by Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte.

Project Design Stage

The Leadership Planning Team developed a district-wide plan of action which was submitted to the Superintendent of Schools and then to the Board of Education for approval. -- 4 days

Mr. Edmonds and Dr.Lezotte assisted the team.

Turnkey and Needs Assessment Stages

1. Building Planning Teams were formed. They consisted of the teachers who were on the district Leadership Planning Team plus others from the building and the principal.

2. In May 1983 all staff members completed the Connecticut School Interview. With the help of Dr. Lezotte and Mr. Edmonds we developed a secondary version of this instrument.

3. During the summer, Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte analyzed the data and prepared summary reports.

4. Disaggregated analyses of student achievement in each building were developed based upon the May 1983 Stanford Achievement Tests.

5. During the late summer Building Planning Teams, using the results of the needs assessment and the school profile prepared by Mr. Edmonds and Dr. Lezotte and the disaggregated analysis of student achievement, developed proposed action plans. They then submitted these plans to their faculty for review, dialogue, and consensus before submitting them to the Superintendent of Schools for approval.

Implementation Stage

During the 1983-84 school year Building Planning Teams and their faculties worked to implement their plan.

An immediate benefit of the project is that the total K-12 faculty is discussing significant issues identified through research. For example, several buildings are trying to determine whether they have a clear sense of mission. Another building is upset over the finding that they may not have high expectations for all students. Primary teachers proposed that the report card be changed to better reflect the research.

Evaluation Stage

1. In May and June of 1984 the Connecticut School Interview was readministered in each building.

2. Updated disaggregated analyses of student achievement were developed using the results of the May 1984 administration of the Stanford Achievement Tests.

3. In July 1984 a workshop was held for Building Planning Teams to teach them how to evaluate the

Evaluation Stage (continued)

data and to use it to build an action plan for 1984-85.

This workshop was led by Dr. Lezotte and Dr. Patrick Proctor.

Future Stages

1. Implementation - to occur in 1984-85.
2. Evaluation - to occur in May to July 1985.

Unique Products of the Project

The following documents have been developed which may be of interest to others.

1. Master Plan, June 1983.

   Project goals, concomitant goals, assumptions and detailed procedures are set forth.

2. Conducting an Effective Schools Project, May 1984.

   This paper sets forth the unique characteristics which identify an effective schools project, operationally defines an effective school and explains how to develop a disaggregated analysis of student achievement.

3. Overview of the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project, December 1983.

   Designed to be read in conjunction with Edmonds article "Educating the Urban Poor," this overview presents his definition of school effectiveness in a different manner and defines the correlates of an effective school.

Copies of these documents can be obtained by completing the attached form.

If you find these documents or the ideas in them useful, permission to either reproduce them or to use them in your documents is granted. We would appreciate it, however, if appropriate credit would be given to the Spencerport Central Schools.

© 1984

Spencerport Central Schools
Spencerport, New York

CONDUCTING AN EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

by

Robert E. Sudlow

May 1984

INTRODUCTION

For the past two years the Spencerport Central School District has been studying and working to implement effective schools research findings. Spencerport is a suburban community located near Rochester, New York. There are 3,351 students K - 12 in three elementary schools, one junior high school and one senior high school.

We have been most fortunate in having as consultants Ronald Edmonds, until his untimely death in July 1983, and Lawrence Lezotte. They helped the district Leadership Planning Team develop a Master Plan which was unanimously approved by both the Team and the Board of Education. This year Dr. Lezotte has worked with Building Planning Teams as they strive to implement effective school characteristics in their buildings. All of the buildings are involved in the project.

The thoughts and concepts in this article are being implemented in a school system which is quite different from the inner-city schools in which the research on effective schools occurred. We are examining whether or not the knowledge gained from the original research is applicable to schools with characteristics other than those of the inner-city. To date we believe that it is. Further, we are ascertaining if this research can be implemented successfully in schools without a massive infusion of money.

As knowledge of Spencerport's efforts slowly spread through Western New York, various individuals discussed effective schools ideas with the author. The opening section of this article is a commentary upon some of these conversations. The second section defines an effective school. It attempts to answer the question: "How do you know an effective school when you see one?" Further, in order to determine if a school is effective, a disaggregated analysis of student achievement must be computed. Consequently the third section of this article discusses how to develop this data.

The definition of an effective school presented in this article, the procedure for computing a disaggregated analysis and other concepts were derived from a series of extensive inservice workshops which Lawrence Lezotte and Ronald Edmonds conducted in the Spencerport Central School District and from reading the literature.

ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Which of the following schools is implementing effective schools research findings?

1. Building A strives systematically to improve school climate.
2. Building B conducts inservice programs on the findings of teacher effectivness research.
3. Building C is developing projects to install the six correlates of an effective school.
4. Building D is implementing a new math program characterized by extensive inservice education, collegial problem sharing and discussion, frequent monitoring of student progress, and periodic modification of instructional content and materials based upon pre - post test results.

Answer: None of them are!

Many excellent projects are being implemented in the name of effective schools, but they are not effective schools projects because they do not contain the essential components of an effective school program. They are:

1. Ultimate accountability in terms of student performance

on standardized tests.

2. Accountability in that the proportion of lower class children who demonstrate at least minimal academic mastery is the same as the proportion of middle and upper class children who demonstrate at least minimal academic mastery.
3. Acceptance of the criteria that ninety-five or greater percent of _all_ students, except the mentally retarded, shall demonstrate minimal academic mastery. Should this not occur, then acceptance of the criteria that there shall be annual gains in the percentage of students demonstrating minimal academic mastery until the ninety-five percent criteria is attained.
4. Acceptance of the definition of minimum academic mastery. It is the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and concepts which enable the student to be demonstrably successful in the next grade level either in his or her school or in any other school in the nation.
5. The will to gather, analyze and publicize disaggregated student achievement data which will demonstrate whether or not the school is effective, or is in the process of becoming effective. Disaggregated student achievement

data is a table which shows the percent of students from the lower and the middle and upper socioeconomic classes who score above and below the minimum academic mastery level.

6. Administration of a needs assessment instrument based upon effective schools research literature.
7. Formation of building level planning teams composed of teachers broadly representative of the faculty who have the respect of their peers and of the building principal.
8. Review and approval by the faculty of the proposed action plan prior to its adoption and implementation.
9. Annual analysis of disaggregated student achievement data in light of the criteria of effectiveness and an annual readministration of the needs assessment instrument to determine if the goals of the building plan are being attained.

Should a project not contain all of the above components, it is not a school effectiveness project. A school effectiveness project is one which accepts the definitions used in the research and systematically attempts to implement the research findings.

Research has identified six correlates of an effective school. Effective school researchers have yet to identify which, if any, correlates are causal or if some correlates are more powerful than others. Hence projects which state, for example, that instructional leadership is the most important correlate and are designed to improve instructional leadership in a building are not school effectiveness projects. If, however, the needs assessment of a building reveals that all of the components of an effective school are in place except instructional leadership and the building's action plan is designed to improve instructional leadership, then the building has a school effectiveness project.

Many educators do not implement the achievement component of an effective schools project. They believe that it is impossible for ninety-five percent of all students to attain minimum academic mastery. This is a policy decision, a value decision because there are schools which meet the rigorous definition of an effective school. Indeed, Edmonds found fifty-five inner city schools in the northeastern United States which met the definition. If one inner city school can attain and maintain this rigorous criterion (let alone fifty-five!) then surely pupil performance is a function of school response to family background rather than a derivative of family background.[1] If effective schools exist in cities, then surely they can exist in rural and suburban communities.

Another reason why educators do not implement the achievement component of an effective schools project is their concern for the affective domain. They believe that since schools strive to attain many important affective goals, reliance upon standardized achievement tests would cause the affective aspects of education either to be ignored or to decline. Fenn and Irvanicki found that "the affective disopsition of students in more effective schools was consistently more positive than that of students in less effective schools."[2] Another perspective is that parents send their children to school to learn. If we as educators fail to meet this minimum expectation, we are remiss. Further, some effective schools researchers state that if there are standardized validated affective tests and, if a building is willing to state that what they measure is the most important educational goal of their building, then these tests should be used in place of standardized criterion referenced or norm referenced achievement tests.

Thus when some educators do not include all of the essential characteristics of an effective schools program in their project they are making value choices.

Hopefully, this discussion of the key characteristics of an effective schools program will serve as a useful tool for those designing or evaluating an effective schools project.

With this background, let us now consider: "What is an effective school?"

WHAT IS AN EFFECTIVE SCHOOL?

An effective school is a building which demonstrates all of the criterion below.

1. Ninety-five, or greater, percent of all students at each grade level demonstrate minimum academic mastery. Students who achieve minimum academic mastery have been prepared so that they will be predictably successful in the next grade in either their own school or in any other school building in the nation. Minimum academic mastery is measured by performance on a standardized achievement test (preferably criterion referenced, otherwise norm referenced).
2. There shall be no significant difference in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socioeconomic class.
3. The above two conditions shall have been obtained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

This definition can be illustrated as follows:

	Low Socio-economic Class	Middle and Upper Socio-economic Classes
At or above minimum academic mastery	95%	95%
Below minimum academic mastery	5%	5%

Should a school not be effective according to the above criteria, then the following definition may be used until the building attains effectiveness:

1. There shall be an annual increase in the proportion of students who demonstrate minimum academic mastery, and
2. There shall be an annual decrease in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socioeconomic class.

Essential to the definition of an effective school is the above operational definition of minimum academic mastery. Minimum academic mastery is determined by a pupil's performance on a standardized test. Ideally this should be a criterion referenced test which measures the curriculum in the school. In the absence of such a test, a norm referenced achievement test should be used. Before a norm referenced test is selected, it is important that its questions be carefully reviewed to see if they reflect the school's curriculum. Some schools use the passing - failing standard for required statewide tests (such as the Pupil Evaluation Program tests or the Regents Examinations in New York State). Others use a predetermined point on a norm referenced test such as the twenty-third percentile (third stanine) or below, or the thirty-ninth percentile (fourth stanine) or below. This cutoff point should be established after examining local score distributions and the relationship between a student's performance on a test and his or her subsequent report card grades. (To parents this is a cardinal indicator of their child's academic performance!)

One additional observation needs to be made regarding the criteria that all students will attain at least minimal academic mastery. This does not mean that the effects of social economic class on student academic performance are totally negated. Family background does not limit a pupil's ability to acquire minimal academic skills, but some families can, and do, enhance their childrens achievement well beyond this level.

COMPUTING A DISAGGREGATED ANALYSIS

In order to know whether a school has achieved, or is maintaining, effectiveness, it is necessary to develop a disaggregated analysis of student achievement at each grade level. This analysis should be done for at least reading and arithmetic. Other subjects such as science and social studies may also be included in the disaggregated analysis at the discretion of the staff.

Two pieces of data are needed for each child: his or her test score and his or her socio-economic status. Many school systems routinely collect socio-economic status data as a part of the kindergarten registration process. Usually they record the education of the mother and father. Many schools which have more than fifteen percent of their students on free or reduced price lunches use this data.

For those schools which have socio-economic data on file. determination of socio-econimic status is not a problem. All which needs to be done is to develop a frequency distribution of socio-economic indicator scores and to draw a line below which at least fifteen to twenty percent of the population falls. This procedure applies equally to school buildings in extrmely poor or extremely affluent areas. In the former, the indicator of low socio-economic status may be a mother who has a sixth grade education or less. In the later it may be a mother who has a masters degree or less.

The problem comes for school systems which do not have socio-economic status indicators on file. Edmonds and Fredericksen at Harvard University studied the relationship between twenty-one socio-economic indicators and pupil performance in school. They found that the level of mothers education was the single most powerful variable. Next came the level of the fathers education. A school district, however, may wish to use only U.S. Census data such as owner-occupied housing units or the average number of rooms in the housing unit. But, these are much less powerful indictors than is mother's or father's education.[3]

Many schools use free and reduced lunches as an indicator of a child's socio-economic status. It is on file and is easily accesible to qualified researchers. Free and reduced lunch data, however, is subject to two types of errors: some families which are eligible choose not to apply for free or reduced price lunches. Other families which may have income greater than the federal guidelines permit apply for and receive free or reduced price school lunches. Thus, this data should be treated with caution, but it is better than no data.

Spencerport did not have socio-economic data on file. Using Edmonds and Fredericksen's research, the district decided to obtain the level of education for both the mother and the father. If a child was living with guardians or foster parents, we obtained the level of education of the adult female and male in the household. If there was no mother in the house, then we used the level of the father's education.

This was done by placing the same educational level question on the Kindergarten registration form, on the new entrant form and on the annual school census form completed by each parent. Parents are asked to indicate the highest grade level completed for both the mother and father. When we collected this data, approximately ten percent of the families either left the question blank or stated that they refused to answer it. Another thirty percent did not return their census forms.

Thus we had a sample of approximately fifty-six percent of the student body. To see if there was any bias or skewedness in the data, a comparison was made with the U.S. Census data for the Town of Ogden in which the Spencerport School District is located. This data revealed that nineteen percent of the population had a college education. Since twenty-two percent of those responding had a college education, we concluded that we had a representative sample.

Finally, once the data was gathered a frequency distribution was developed in order to determine the cutoff point betwen lower and middle - upper socio-economic classes. A cutoff point of a high school education or less which included 54.4% of the respondents was chosen. If a cutoff point of completion of eleven years of school or less had been chosen, it would have included only 5.5% of the population; we judged this percentage to be too small.

As a result of following a process such as the above, a school will obtain data which appears as follows:

Child No.	Level of Education	SES Status	Total Reading Percentile
1	17	U	98
2	12	L	10
3	19	U	75
4	11	L	43
5	20	U	50
6	14	U	63
7	10	L	45
8	16	U	42
9	9	L	18
10	13	U	55
11	11	L	88
12	13	U	37

This data is next transferred to a preliminary table such as the following:

	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	3	6
40th Percentile		
Below Minimum Mastery	2	1

And then to a final table:

	High School	Post High School
Minimum Academic Mastery	60%	86%
40th Percentile		
Below Minimum Mastery	40%	14%

If a school does a disaggregarted analysis of student achievement according to the criteria and procedures discussed above, then it will have completed a valid disaggregated analysis. The key question, however, is: Does a school want to do this? Does a school have the courage to ascertain whether it provides a better education for one group of children as compared to another? Some administrators and leaders feel that computation and revelation of the results of a disaggregated analysis could be politically damaging, that they could set off a public relations furor. Other administrators and leaders believe that a disaggregated analaysis of student achievement is an essential first step to program improvement. Without objective analyses such as this, it is impossible to know where the problems are and hence to know what needs to be done to improve the education of all children entrusted to their care. This is a very defensible position to take with boards of education and the public --- but only if subsequent program improvement efforts are implemented and evaluated through annual disaggregated analyses of student achievement.

One final point needs to be made regarding disaggregated analyses of student achievement. It is a very simple, effective tool which can be used to prove or disprove other hypotheses. For example:

1. Does student achievement differ according to gender, race, and/or ethnicity?
2. Do patterns of grading differ according to social class, ethnicity, race and/or gender?
3. Do patterns of course selections (i.e. Which students take which courses?) differ?[4]

Answering questions such as these through computing a disaggregated analysis helps an administrator, a consultant, an evaluator, a teacher better know what is occurring in school.

POSTSCRIPT

During the 1982 - 83 school year the Spencerport Central School District formed a Leadership Planning Team consisting of key teachers from each building, their principal and several district personnel. After participating in an extensive series of workshops conducted by Lawrence Lezotte and Ronald Edmonds the Team developed and unaminously approved a districtwide Master Plan. It was approved by the Superintendent of Schools and unaminously approved by the Board of Education. Ronald Edmonds stated that the Master Plan is "a truly outstanding operational statement of the research and its implications."

Subsequently each building formed its own planning team and developed a plan of action based upon the results of the disaggregatd analysis of student achievement in the building and upon the results of a needs assessment profile of the building. These plans were the major focus of each buildings activities in 1983 - 84. They caused staffs to think and talk about important, key educational issues. This alone is a significant benefit of the project!

At the time this article is being written (May 1984), the buildings are readministering the needs assessment instrument and achievement testing is occurring. This new data will serve as an evaluation of the first years activities and as a basis for the building planning teams to develop plans for the second year of their long range project.

Should readers desire more information regarding Spencerport's More Effective Schools/Teaching Project they may write to:

Dr. Robert E. Sudlow
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Spencerport Central Schools
71 Lyell Avenue
Spencerport, New York 14559

FOOTNOTES

1. Edmonds, Ronald, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, Oct. 1979, 22 - 23.

2. Fenn, Lawrence M. and Iwanicki, Edward F., "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Student Affective Characteristics and Student Achievement Within More and Less Effective School Settings," Paper Presented at the 1983 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 17.

3. Edmonds, Ronald and Fredericksen, John, Identification of Instructionally Effective and Ineffective Schools, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1978.

4. Shoemaker, Joan, Research Based School Improvement Practices. Hartford, Conn.: Connecticut State Department of Education, 1984, 23 - 24.

APPENDIX E

Summary of Responses to the Connecticut School Interview

May 1983 and May 1984

Bernabi

Munn

Town Line

Cosgrove

Wilson

BERNABI SCHOOL

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
1. ADULTS AND STUDENTS FEEL THAT THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE BUILDING IS SAFE AND ORDERLY.	1983	0%	3%	97%		*
	1984	0	0	100		*
2. SCHOOL AND CLASS BEHAVIOR ARE GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE.	1983	3	31	66		*
	1984	0	48	51		
3. DISCIPLINE IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	0	19	81		*
	1984	0	12	88		*
4. THE SCHOOL BUILDING IS CLEAN AND WELL TAKEN CARE OF BY STAFF AND STUDENTS.	1983	0	25	76		*
	1984	3	18	78		*
5. STUDENTS ARE GENERALLY POSITIVE ABOUT SCHOOL AND LEARNING.	1983	3	9	87		*
	1984	0	6	94		*
AVERAGE	1983	1	17	81		*
	1984	1	17	82		*

BERNABI

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
6. THERE IS A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PURPOSE WHICH GUIDES THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM OF THIS SCHOOL.	1983	37	13	40		
	1984	9	6	85		*
7. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES ON WHICH A CURRICULAR AREA IS, BASED EXIST AT ALL GRADES.	1983	6	0	87		*
	1984	0	0	97		*
8. SCHOOL-WIDE OBJECTIVES GUIDE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	22	13	66		*
	1984	0	6	91		*
9. EACH GRADE LEVEL HAS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF SKILLS OR OBJECTIVES THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	9	9	72		*
	1984	0	3	94		*
10. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES IN THE AREA OF LANGUAGE ARTS EXIST THROUGH ALL GRADES.	1983	15	6	63		
	1984	0	3	85		*
11. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES IN LANGUAGE ARTS GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	19	22	47		
	1984	0	6	78		*
12. IN LANGUAGE ARTS THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF OBJECTIVES OR SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	16	13	53		
	1984	0	3	82		*
13. IN MATHEMATICS THERE IS A SET OF SPECIFIC WRITTEN OBJECTIVES ON WHICH THE PROGRAM IS BASED.	1983	6	0	66		*
	1984	0	6	85		*
14. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES IN MATHEMATICS GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	6	0	72		*
	1984	0	3	81		*
15. IN MATHEMATICS THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF OBJECTIVES OR SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	6	13	56		
	1984	3	6	72		*
16. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED MOST OFTEN TO CARRY OUT INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES ARE AVAILABLE.	1983	22	25	50		
	1984	9	18	69		*
AVERAGE	1983	15	10	61		
	1984	2	5	84		*

HIGH EXPECTATIONS	BERNABI		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
36.	NINETY PERCENT OR HIGHER OF STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.	1983	0	6	85		*
		1984	0	3	91		*
37.	TEACHERS BELIEVE THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR STUDENTS TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS AT THEIR GRADE LEVEL.	1983	9	41	50		
		1984	0	9	88		*
38.	TEACHERS BELIEVE THAT ALL STUDENTS CAN MASTER BASIC SKILLS REGARDLESS OF HOME BACKGROUND FACTORS.	1983	34	34	32		
		1984	18	15	63		
39.	TEACHERS HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS THAT ALL STUDENTS WILL LEARN.	1983	38	13	50		
		1984	0	12	88		*
40.	THE NUMBER OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN RETAINED IN GRADES IS PROPORTIONATELY EQUIVALENT TO OTHERS RETAINED.	1983	0	9	60		
		1984	3	3	82		*
41.	ALMOST ALL STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL CAN BE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL.	1983	0	6	79		*
		1984	0	3	91		*
42.	DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS ARE SPREAD ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES OF STUDENTS NOT JUST LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS.	1983	38	31	31		
		1984	9	15	73		*
43.	LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS OFTEN AS OTHERS DURING LARGE GROUP CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	0	41	53		
		1984	3	18	63		
44.							
45.	MOST INITIAL MATH INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	25	19	28		
		1984	24	12	33		
46.	MOST INITIAL READING INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	22	19	32		
		1984	27	15	24		
	AVERAGE	1983	17	22	50		
		1984	8	11	70		*

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK	BERNABI		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
47.	AT LEAST ONE HOUR AND 20 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR READING IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983	19	9	47		
		1984	42	18	9		
48.	AT LEAST ONE HOUR AND 20 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983					
		1984	45	9	12		
49.	AT LEAST 45 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR MATH IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983	6	50	12		
		1984	3	39	24		
50.	TIME ALLOTMENTS FOR EACH BASIC SKILL AREA ARE SET BY THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS AND MONITORED PERIODICALLY.	1983	50	13	22		
		1984	24	6	54		
51.	BASIC SKILLS INSTRUCTION TIME IS RARELY AFFECTED BY OUTSIDE INTERRUPTIONS.	1983	16	22	53		
		1984	12	18	63		
52.	PULL-OUT PROGRAMS SUPPLEMENT CLASS INSTRUCTION.	1983	60	6	19		
		1984	42	12	30		
53.	THERE ARE FEW STUDENT DISRUPTIONS DURING CLASS.	1983	9	34	56		
		1984	6	21	66		*

54. LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME OF BASIC SKILL INSTRUCTION IS ALLOCATED FOR INDEPENDENT SEAT WORK.	1983	3	16	59		
	1984	12	12	48		
55. STUDENTS GENERALLY HAVE AT LEAST 75% OR BETTER OF ASSIGNED PRACTICE WORK CORRECT.	1983	3	3	72		*
	1984	3	9	66		*
56. INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS FOLLOW THE GENERAL FORMAT: PRESENTATION, PRACTICE AND OCCASIONAL FEEDBACK DURING PRACTICE.	1983	3	23	66		*
	1984	3	12	70		*
AVERAGE	1983	19	20	45		
	1984	19	16	44		

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS	BERNABI	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
57. THERE IS ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TESTING AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.	1983	3	0	87		*
	1984	0	0	91		*
58. ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS ARE SYSTEMATICALLY USED TO EVALUATE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.	1983	9	19	63		
	1984	3	3	88		*
59. THE STANDARDIZED TESTS USED IN THIS SCHOOL ARE A VALID MEASURE OF THE BASIC SKILLS CURRICULUM.	1983	0	31	53		
	1984	3	9	82		*
60. STUDENT PROGRESS IN BASIC SKILLS IS ASSESSED BY FREQUENT AND SYSTEMATIC SKILL TESTING.	1983	15	0	78		*
	1984	6	3	76		*
61. STUDENT PROGRESS IN BASIC SKILLS IS ASSESSED SYSTEMATICALLY BY VARIOUS METHODS, CRT'S, UNIT TESTS, STUDENT WORK, ETC.	1983	12	9	69		*
	1984	12	3	64		
62. INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM BASIC SKILLS TESTING IN THE CLASSROOM IS USED FOR SPECIFIC FEEDBACK AND INSTRUCTION IS AT LEAST SOMEWHAT CHANGED AS A RESULT.	1983	15	6	72		*
	1984	0	6	76		*
63. THERE IS A CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING PROGRAM IN AT LEAST TWO BASIC SKILL AREAS.	1983	3	50	28		
	1984	0	53	30		
64. INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS USE CRT'S TO CHECK STUDENT MASTERY AND TO PLAN THE NEXT INSTRUCTIONAL SEQUENCE FOR THEIR GROUP.	1983	6	9	66		*
	1984	0	6	73		*
AVERAGE	1983	8	16	65		
	1984	3	11	73		*

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS	BERNABI	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
65. THERE IS AN ACTIVE PARENT ORGANIZATION.	1983	9	24	64		
	1984	3	18	79		*
66. PARENTS ARE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN SUPPORTING THE SCHOOL PROGRAM.	1983	18	15	67		*
	1984	3	12	85		*
67. A VAST MAJORITY OF PARENTS ATTEND SCHEDULED PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES.	1983	0	9	79		*
	1984	0	0	82		*
68. THERE IS FORMAL AND INFORMAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PARENTS AND TEACHERS.	1983	3	22	75		*
	1984	3	6	84		*

[illegible]	MANY PARENTS INITIATE TEACHER CONTACTS.	1983	42	30	24		
		1984	21	27	51		
70.	THE SCHOOL HAS A WRITTEN POLICY ON HOMEWORK, AND HOMEWORK IS REGULARLY ASSIGNED TO ALL STUDENTS.	1983	44	28	3		
		1984	21	9	57		
71.	MOST PARENTS UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT THEIR ROLE IN MONITORING HOMEWORK.	1983	43	39	6		
		1984	24	30	24		
72.	MORE THAN 75% OF STUDENTS COMPLETE ASSIGNED HOMEWORK.	1983	0	9	66		*
		1984	3	3	66		*
73.	PARENTS WOULD EVALUATE THIS SCHOOL BY GIVING A GRADE OF A OR B.	1983	72	25	0	*	
		1984	18	3	76		*
	AVERAGE	1983	26	22	43		
		1984	11	12	67		*

MUNN SCHOOL

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
1. ADULTS AND STUDENTS FEEL THAT THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE BUILDING IS SAFE AND ORDERLY.	1983	0%	4%	96%		*
	1984	0	3	97		*
2. SCHOOL AND CLASS BEHAVIOR ARE GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE.	1983	11	46	43		
	1984	23	53	20		
3. DISCIPLINE IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	18	43	39		
	1984	10	57	33		
4. THE SCHOOL BUILDING IS CLEAN AND WELL TAKEN CARE OF BY STAFF AND STUDENTS.	1983	4	7	89		*
	1984	3	33	63		
5. STUDENTS ARE GENERALLY POSITIVE ABOUT SCHOOL AND LEARNING.	1983	4	25	71		*
	1984	0	30	70		*
AVERAGE	1983	7	25	68		*
	1984	7	35	57		

MUNN

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION

		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
6. THERE IS A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PURPOSE WHICH GUIDES THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM OF THIS SCHOOL.	1983	32	21	39		
	1984	20	27	53		
7. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES ON WHICH A CURRICULAR AREA IS BASED EXIST AT ALL GRADES.	1983	8	11	78		*
	1984	7	10	83		*
8. SCHOOL-WIDE OBJECTIVES GUIDE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	14	14	75		*
	1984	20	7	74		*
9. EACH GRADE LEVEL HAS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF SKILLS OR OBJECTIVES THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	14	18	65		
	1984	13	20	64		
10. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES IN THE AREA OF LANGUAGE ARTS EXIST THROUGH ALL GRADES.	1983	7	4	79		*
	1984	13	10	67		*
11. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES IN LANGUAGE ARTS GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	18	18	54		
	1984	13	23	53		
12. IN LANGUAGE ARTS THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF OBJECTIVES OR SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	11	25	53		
	1984	7	20	63		
13. IN MATHEMATICS THERE IS A SET OF SPECIFIC WRITTEN OBJECTIVES ON WHICH THE PROGRAM IS BASED.	1983	8	7	68		*
	1984	3	3	84		*
14. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES IN MATHEMATICS GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	4	14	60		
	1984	7	10	73		*
15. IN MATHEMATICS THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF OBJECTIVES OR SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	15	4	64		
	1984	0	20	70		*
16. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED MOST OFTEN TO CARRY OUT INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES ARE AVAILABLE.	1983	18	36	46		
	1984	10	43	43		
AVERAGE	1983	14	16	62		
	1984	10	18	66		*

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP	MUNN				AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
17. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL.	1983	43	7	50		
	1984	34	20	44		
18. THE PRINCIPAL PROMOTES FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.	1983	36	21	36		
	1984	20	37	40		
19. TEACHER LEADERS PROMOTE FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.	1983	39	29	22		
	1984	44	20	34		
20. THE PRINCIPAL MAKES FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	89	0	11	*	
	1984	94	3	3	*	
21. A TYPICAL FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION IS PLANNED BY THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER AT A PRE-CONFERENCE FOLLOWED BY A POST-CONFERENCE.	1983	0	4	96		*
	1984	0	10	90		*
22. THE PRINCIPAL ENGAGES IN A POST-OBSERVATION THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	89	0	7	*	
	1984	93	3	3	*	
23. AFTER A CLASSROOM OBSERVATION THE PRINCIPAL PROVIDES FEEDBACK PRIMARILY ON INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.	1983	11	14	75		*
	1984	3	17	80		*
24. THE PRINCIPAL IS REGULARLY VISIBLE AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	14	18	68		*
	1984	7	10	84		*
25. THE SCHOOL REQUIRES AND REVIEWS LESSON PLANS REGULARLY.	1983	61	32	4		
	1984	7	57	37		
26. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE PRINCIPAL.	1983	39	43	18		
	1984	40	50	7		
27. THE PRINCIPAL PERIODICALLY DISCUSSES INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES WITH THE TEACHER.	1983	50	39	11		
	1984	34	60	7		
28. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE TEACHER LEADER.	1983	32	54	7		
	1984	30	57	10		
29. THE PRINCIPAL REGULARLY REVIEWS AND INTERPRETS TEST RESULTS WITH FACULTY.	1983	7	11	68		*
	1984	3	3	94		*
30. THE PRINCIPAL FREQUENTLY COMMUNICATES TO TEACHERS THEIR RESPONSIBILITY IN RELATION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.	1983	36	39	21		
	1984	37	40	17		
31. THE PRINCIPAL REGULARLY ARRANGES OR PROMOTES STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.	1983	43	36	22		
	1984	36	40	16		
32. THE TEACHER LEADERS REGULARLY ARRANGE OR PROMOTE STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.	1983	50	29	18		
	1984	47	43	6		
33. THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.	1983	47	11	36		
	1984	40	27	30		
34. TEACHER LEADERS AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.	1983	50	7	28		
	1984	47	27	23		
35. FACULTY MEETINGS PRIMARILY DEAL WITH INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.	1983	32	21	43		
	1984	20	27	53		
AVERAGE	1983	40	22	34		
	1984	33	29	36		

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

	MUNN	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
36. NINETY PERCENT OR HIGHER OF STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.	1983	0	18	71		*
	1984	7	7	84		*
37. TEACHERS BELIEVE THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR STUDENTS TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS AT THEIR GRADE LEVEL.	1983	4	50	39		
	1984	3	17	77		*
38. TEACHERS BELIEVE THAT ALL STUDENTS CAN MASTER BASIC SKILLS REGARDLESS OF HOME BACKGROUND FACTORS.	1983	21	57	21		
	1984	20	43	33		
39. TEACHERS HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS THAT ALL STUDENTS WILL LEARN.	1983	29	18	53		
	1984	20	17	63		
40. THE NUMBER OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN RETAINED IN GRADES IS PROPORTIONATELY EQUIVALENT TO OTHERS RETAINED.	1983	4	7	64		
	1984	6	7	80		*
41. ALMOST ALL STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL CAN BE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL.	1983	7	14	75		*
	1984	0	17	80		*
42. DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS ARE SPREAD ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES OF STUDENTS NOT JUST LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS.	1983	33	32	36		
	1984	60	7	27		
43. LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS OFTEN AS OTHERS DURING LARGE GROUP CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	7	39	42		
	1984	6	40	47		
44.						
45. MOST INITIAL MATH INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	11	21	46		
	1984	24	30	34		
46. MOST INITIAL READING INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	25	36	8		
	1984	23	33	24		
AVERAGE	1983	14	29	46		
	1984	17	22	55		

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK

	MUNN	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
47. AT LEAST ONE HOUR AND 20 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR READING IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983	4	18	47		
	1984	57	7	20		
48. AT LEAST ONE HOUR AND 20 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983					
	1984	66	7	10	*	
49. AT LEAST 45 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR MATH IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983	11	43	21		
	1984	13	53	20		
50. TIME ALLOTMENTS FOR EACH BASIC SKILL AREA ARE SET BY THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS AND MONITORED PERIODICALLY.	1983	53	18	25		
	1984	43	20	30		
51. BASIC SKILLS INSTRUCTION TIME IS RARELY AFFECTED BY OUTSIDE INTERRUPTIONS.	1983	39	25	29		
	1984	17	33	46		
52. PULL-OUT PROGRAMS SUPPLEMENT CLASS INSTRUCTION.	1983	68	18	14	*	
	1984	77	7	14	*	
53. THERE ARE FEW STUDENT DISRUPTIONS DURING CLASS.	1983	18	50	32		
	1984	20	40	[illegible]		

54. LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME OF BASIC SKILL INSTRUCTION IS ALLOCATED FOR INDEPENDENT SEAT WORK.	1983	0	18	68		*
	1984	13	13	64		
55. STUDENTS GENERALLY HAVE AT LEAST 75% OR BETTER OF ASSIGNED PRACTICE WORK CORRECT.	1983	0	11	82		*
	1984	0	17	77		*
56. INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS FOLLOW THE GENERAL FORMAT: PRESENTATION, PRACTICE AND OCCASIONAL FEEDBACK DURING PRACTICE.	1983	4	39	57		
	1984	7	27	66		*
AVERAGE	1983	22	27	42		
	1984	31	22	38		

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS	MUNN ****	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	STRENGTH
57. THERE IS ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TESTING AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.	1983	0	0	100		*
	1984	0	0	100		*
58. ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS ARE SYSTEMATICALLY USED TO EVALUATE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.	1983	18	18	43		
	1984	7	3	86		*
59. THE STANDARDIZED TESTS USED IN THIS SCHOOL ARE A VALID MEASURE OF THE BASIC SKILLS CURRICULUM.	1983	4	32	57		
	1984	3	37	57		
60. STUDENT PROGRESS IN BASIC SKILLS IS ASSESSED BY FREQUENT AND SYSTEMATIC SKILL TESTING.	1983	4	0	82		*
	1984	13	3	80		*
61. STUDENT PROGRESS IN BASIC SKILLS IS ASSESSED SYSTEMATICALLY BY VARIOUS METHODS, CRT'S, UNIT TESTS, STUDENT WORK, ETC.	1983	11	0	72		*
	1984	10	7	77		*
62. INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM BASIC SKILLS TESTING IN THE CLASSROOM IS USED FOR SPECIFIC FEEDBACK AND INSTRUCTION IS AT LEAST SOMEWHAT CHANGED AS A RESULT.	1983	0	0	93		*
	1984	0	3	97		*
63. THERE IS A CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING PROGRAM IN AT LEAST TWO BASIC SKILL AREAS.	1983	0	50	35		
	1984	3	53	30		
64. INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS USE CRT'S TO CHECK STUDENT MASTERY AND TO PLAN THE NEXT INSTRUCTIONAL SEQUENCE FOR THEIR GROUP.	1983	4	0	73		*
	1984	14	13	60		
AVERAGE	1983	5	13	70		*
	1984	6	15	73		*

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS	MUNN ****	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	STRENGTH
65. THERE IS AN ACTIVE PARENT ORGANIZATION.	1983	11	14	75		*
	1984	0	3	97		*
66. PARENTS ARE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN SUPPORTING THE SCHOOL PROGRAM.	1983	29	14	57		
	1984	3	13	84		*
67. A VAST MAJORITY OF PARENTS ATTEND SCHEDULED PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES.	1983	14	4	79		*
	1984	3	17	74		*
68. THERE IS FORMAL AND INFORMAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PARENTS AND	1983	0	18	79		*
	1984	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		

69. MANY PARENTS INITIATE TEACHER CONTACTS.	1983	40	46	14	
	1984	27	47	23	
70. THE SCHOOL HAS A WRITTEN POLICY ON HOMEWORK, AND HOMEWORK IS REGULARLY ASSIGNED TO ALL STUDENTS.	1983	50	36	4	
	1984	46	47	7	
71. MOST PARENTS UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT THEIR ROLE IN MONITORING HOMEWORK.	1983	47	43	4	
	1984	27	63	7	
72. MORE THAN 75% OF STUDENTS COMPLETE ASSIGNED HOMEWORK.	1983	7	11	71	*
	1984	3	7	73	*
73. PARENTS WOULD EVALUATE THIS SCHOOL BY GIVING A GRADE OF A OR B.	1983	4	18	82	*
	1984	20	7	73	*
AVERAGE	1983	22	23	52	
	1984	15	24	58	*

TOWN LINE SCHOOL

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
1. ADULTS AND STUDENTS FEEL THAT THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE BUILDING IS SAFE AND ORDERLY.	1983	3%	45%	51%		
	1984	0	6	94		*
2. SCHOOL AND CLASS BEHAVIOR ARE GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE.	1983	0	10	89		*
	1984	0	31	69		*
3. DISCIPLINE IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	3	17	79		*
	1984	0	16	85		*
4. THE SCHOOL BUILDING IS CLEAN AND WELL TAKEN CARE OF BY STAFF AND STUDENTS.	1983	20	38	38		
	1984	25	38	38		
5. STUDENTS ARE GENERALLY POSITIVE ABOUT SCHOOL AND LEARNING.	1983	3	24	72		*
	1984	3	9	87		*
AVERAGE	1983	6	27	66		*
	1984	6	20	75		*

TOWN LINE

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
6. THERE IS A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PURPOSE WHICH GUIDES THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM OF THIS SCHOOL.	1983	31	31	34		
	1984	25	28	41		
7. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES ON WHICH A CURRICULAR AREA IS BASED EXIST AT ALL GRADES.	1983	3	3	83		*
	1984	3	6	84		*
8. SCHOOL-WIDE OBJECTIVES GUIDE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	27	17	45		
	1984	3	16	76		*
9. EACH GRADE LEVEL HAS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF SKILLS OR OBJECTIVES THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	14	17	58		
	1984	3	3	88		*
10. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES IN THE AREA OF LANGUAGE ARTS EXIST THROUGH ALL GRADES.	1983	7	7	73		*
	1984	0	3	81		*
11. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES IN LANGUAGE ARTS GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	7	24	55		
	1984	9	13	60		
12. IN LANGUAGE ARTS THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF OBJECTIVES OR SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	12	3	71		*
	1984	0	13	69		*
13. IN MATHEMATICS THERE IS A SET OF SPECIFIC WRITTEN OBJECTIVES ON WHICH THE PROGRAM IS BASED.	1983	0	10	76		*
	1984	0	3	81		*
14. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES IN MATHEMATICS GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	10	10	66		*
	1984	0	13	68		*
15. IN MATHEMATICS THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF OBJECTIVES OR SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	3	10	73		*
	1984	0	3	78		*
16. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED MOST OFTEN TO CARRY OUT INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES ARE AVAILABLE.	1983	24	31	45		
	1984	9	34	50		
AVERAGE	1983	13	15	62		
	1984	5	12	71		*

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP	TOWN LINE		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
17. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL.		1983	10	21	69		*
		1984	0	28	69		*
18. THE PRINCIPAL PROMOTES FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.		1983	13	41	42		
		1984	16	28	56		
19. TEACHER LEADERS PROMOTE FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.		1983	38	38	17		
		1984	41	19	22		
20. THE PRINCIPAL MAKES FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.		1983	86	3	3	*	
		1984	84	3	3	*	
21. A TYPICAL FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION IS PLANNED BY THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER AT A PRE-CONFERENCE FOLLOWED BY A POST-CONFERENCE.		1983	0	7	89		*
		1984	6	0	94		*
22. THE PRINCIPAL ENGAGES IN A POST-OBSERVATION THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.		1983	83	3	7	*	
		1984	88	6	3	*	
23. AFTER A CLASSROOM OBSERVATION THE PRINCIPAL PROVIDES FEEDBACK PRIMARILY ON INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.		1983	0	3	96		*
		1984	0	6	94		*
24. THE PRINCIPAL IS REGULARLY VISIBLE AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN THE SCHOOL.		1983	3	17	79		*
		1984	13	6	82		*
25. THE SCHOOL REQUIRES AND REVIEWS LESSON PLANS REGULARLY.		1983	62	34	0		
		1984	47	41	9		
26. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE PRINCIPAL.		1983	41	38	13		
		1984	29	53	19		
27. THE PRINCIPAL PERIODICALLY DISCUSSES INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES WITH THE TEACHER.		1983	31	45	17		
		1984	25	47	28		
28. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE TEACHER LEADER.		1983	48	41	6		
		1984	57	22	19		
29. THE PRINCIPAL REGULARLY REVIEWS AND INTERPRETS TEST RESULTS WITH FACULTY.		1983	3	21	55		
		1984	3	13	72		*
30. THE PRINCIPAL FREQUENTLY COMMUNICATES TO TEACHERS THEIR RESPONSIBILITY IN RELATION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.		1983	48	21	24		
		1984	25	31	40		
31. THE PRINCIPAL REGULARLY ARRANGES OR-PROMOTES STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.		1983	17	45	38		
		1984	19	50	25		
32. THE TEACHER LEADERS REGULARLY ARRANGE OR PROMOTE STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.		1983	31	55	0		
		1984	38	34	19		
33. THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.		1983	28	28	35		
		1984	16	22	56		
34. TEACHER LEADERS AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.		1983	54	21	6		
		1984	47	9	29		
35. FACULTY MEETINGS PRIMARILY DEAL WITH INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.		1983	10	38	48		
		1984	6	50	44		
	AVERAGE	1983	32	27	34		
		1984	29	25	41		

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

TOWN LINE

					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
36. NINETY PERCENT OR HIGHER OF STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.	1983	0	3	90		*
	1984	0	0	97		*
37. TEACHERS BELIEVE THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR STUDENTS TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS AT THEIR GRADE LEVEL.	1983	3	52	44		
	1984	3	25	72		*
38. TEACHERS BELIEVE THAT ALL STUDENTS CAN MASTER BASIC SKILLS REGARDLESS OF HOME BACKGROUND FACTORS.	1983	28	41	31		
	1984	25	28	47		
39. TEACHERS HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS THAT ALL STUDENTS WILL LEARN.	1983	21	28	52		
	1984	3	25	72		*
40. THE NUMBER OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN RETAINED IN GRADES IS PROPORTIONATELY EQUIVALENT TO OTHERS RETAINED.	1983	0	3	55		
	1984	6	3	62		
41. ALMOST ALL STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL CAN BE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL.	1983	3	3	93		*
	1984	0	0	94		*
42. DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS ARE SPREAD ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES OF STUDENTS NOT JUST LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS.	1983	35	31	34		
	1984	13	38	47		
43. LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS OFTEN AS OTHERS DURING LARGE GROUP CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	17	21	55		
	1984	3	44	44		
44.						
45. MOST INITIAL MATH INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	6	41	21		
	1984	6	31	26		
46. MOST INITIAL READING INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	14	45	13		
	1984	3	53	9		
AVERAGE	1983	13	27	49		
	1984	6	25	57		

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK

TOWN LINE

					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
47. AT LEAST ONE HOUR AND 20 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR READING IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983	14	14	45		
	1984	38	3	28		
48. AT LEAST ONE HOUR AND 20 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983					
	1984	63	6	3		
49. AT LEAST 45 MINUTES PER DAY IS ALLOCATED FOR MATH IN THE CLASSROOM.	1983	14	38	20		
	1984	12	38	22		
50. TIME ALLOTMENTS FOR EACH BASIC SKILL AREA ARE SET BY THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS AND MONITORED PERIODICALLY.	1983	65	14	7		
	1984	50	6	19		
51. BASIC SKILLS INSTRUCTION TIME IS RARELY AFFECTED BY OUTSIDE INTERRUPTIONS.	1983	10	34	42		
	1984	9	9	75		*
52. PULL-OUT PROGRAMS SUPPLEMENT CLASS INSTRUCTION.	1983	44	21	21		
	1984	41	6	50		
53. THERE ARE FEW STUDENT DISRUPTIONS DURING CLASS.	1983	3	45	41		
	1984	3	44	50		

		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
54. LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME OF BASIC SKILL INSTRUCTION IS ALLOCATED FOR INDEPENDENT SEAT WORK.	1983	3	24	52		
	1984	6	16	56		
55. STUDENTS GENERALLY HAVE AT LEAST 75% OR BETTER OF ASSIGNED PRACTICE WORK CORRECT.	1983	3	10	69		*
	1984	0	9	78		*
56. INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS FOLLOW THE GENERAL FORMAT: PRESENTATION, PRACTICE AND OCCASIONAL FEEDBACK DURING PRACTICE.	1983	0	38	52		
	1984	0	34	63		
AVERAGE	1983	17	26	39		
	1984	22	17	44		

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

TOWN LINE

		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
57. THERE IS ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TESTING AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.	1983	0	0	89		*
	1984	0	3	87		*
58. ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS ARE SYSTEMATICALLY USED TO EVALUATE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.	1983	20	17	52		
	1984	6	25	57		
59. THE STANDARDIZED TESTS USED IN THIS SCHOOL ARE A VALID MEASURE OF THE BASIC SKILLS CURRICULUM.	1983	3	10	76		*
	1984	0	16	69		*
60. STUDENT PROGRESS IN BASIC SKILLS IS ASSESSED BY FREQUENT AND SYSTEMATIC SKILL TESTING.	1983	17	7	66		*
	1984	15	6	72		*
61. STUDENT PROGRESS IN BASIC SKILLS IS ASSESSED SYSTEMATICALLY BY VARIOUS METHODS, CRT'S, UNIT TESTS, STUDENT WORK, ETC.	1983	24	3	62		
	1984	6	13	72		*
62. INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM BASIC SKILLS TESTING IN THE CLASSROOM IS USED FOR SPECIFIC FEEDBACK AND INSTRUCTION IS AT LEAST SOMEWHAT CHANGED AS A RESULT.	1983	0	3	86		*
	1984	3	3	81		*
63. THERE IS A CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING PROGRAM IN AT LEAST TWO BASIC SKILL AREAS.	1983	0	34	55		
	1984	0	53	25		
64. INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS USE CRT'S TO CHECK STUDENT MASTERY AND TO PLAN THE NEXT INSTRUCTIONAL SEQUENCE FOR THEIR GROUP.	1983	0	17	65		
	1984	3	13	63		
AVERAGE	1983	8	11	69		*
	1984	4	17	66		*

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

TOWN LINE

		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
65. THERE IS AN ACTIVE PARENT ORGANIZATION.	1983	21	10	65		
	1984	0	0	94		*
66. PARENTS ARE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN SUPPORTING THE SCHOOL PROGRAM.	1983	7	14	79		*
	1984	3	9	82		*
67. A VAST MAJORITY OF PARENTS ATTEND SCHEDULED PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES.	1983	17	0	69		*
	1984	3	6	81		*
68. THERE IS FORMAL AND INFORMAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PARENTS AND TEACHERS.	1983	3	10	86		*
	1984	3	13	85		*

69. MANY PARENTS INITIATE TEACHER CONTACTS.	1983	36	17	26	
	1984	47	28	18	
70. THE SCHOOL HAS A WRITTEN POLICY ON HOMEWORK, AND HOMEWORK IS REGULARLY ASSIGNED TO ALL STUDENTS.	1983	42	31	14	
	1984	41	38	12	
71. MOST PARENTS UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT THEIR ROLE IN MONITORING HOMEWORK.	1983	31	38	13	
	1984	22	41	22	
72. MORE THAN 75% OF STUDENTS COMPLETE ASSIGNED HOMEWORK.	1983	0	7	52	
	1984	0	9	59	
73. PARENTS WOULD EVALUATE THIS SCHOOL BY GIVING A GRADE OF A OR B.	1983	0	24	72	*
	1984	19	6	72	*
AVERAGE	1983	20	17	53	
	1984	15	17	58	

COSGROVE SCHOOL

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
1. ADULTS AND STUDENTS FEEL THAT THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE BUILDING IS SAFE AND ORDERLY.	1983	0%	5%	95%		*
	1984	5	12	84		*
2. SCHOOL AND CLASS BEHAVIOR ARE GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE.	1983	2	66	31		
	1984	16	62	21		
3. DISCIPLINE IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	7	59	33		
	1984	19	57	23		
4. THE SCHOOL BUILDING IS CLEAN AND WELL TAKEN CARE OF BY STAFF AND STUDENTS.	1983	76	18	6	*	
	1984	7	55	39		
5. STUDENTS ARE GENERALLY POSITIVE ABOUT SCHOOL AND LEARNING.	1983	2	59	38		
	1984	0	60	41		
AVERAGE	1983	17	41	41		
	1984	9	49	42		

COSGROVE

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
6. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL.	1983	19	24	57		
	1984	33	17	50		
7. THE PRINCIPAL PROMOTES FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.	1983	9	43	48		
	1984	12	29	59		
8. TEACHER LEADERS PROMOTE FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.	1983	26	31	38		
	1984	24	14	62		
9. THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL(S) PROMOTES FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.	1983	55	14	31		
	1984	48	17	36		
10. THE PRINCIPAL MAKES FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	87	11	2	*	
	1984	88	7	2	*	
11. THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL(S) MAKES FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	63	15	0		
	1984	81	14	2	*	
12. A TYPICAL FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION IS PLANNED BY THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER AT A PRE-CONFERENCE FOLLOWED BY A POST-CONFERENCE.	1983	0	9	90		*
	1984	2	5	90		*
13. THE PRINCIPAL ENGAGES IN A POST-OBSERVATION THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	82	9	6	*	
	1984	88	10	0	*	
14. THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL(S) ENGAGES IN A POST-OBSERVATION THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	58	7	4		
	1984	78	7	10	*	
15. AFTER A CLASSROOM OBSERVATION THE PRINCIPAL PROVIDES FEEDBACK PRIMARILY ON INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.	1983	2	17	74		*
	1984	2	14	81		*
16. AFTER A CLASSROOM OBSERVATION THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL(S) PROVIDES FEEDBACK PRIMARILY ON INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.	1983	2	20	58		
	1984	5	17	74		*
17. THE PRINCIPAL IS REGULARLY VISIBLE AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	2	31	67		*
	1984	15	29	57		

18. THE SCHOOL REQUIRES AND REVIEWS LESSON PLANS REGULARLY.	1983	2	33	64		
	1984	0	24	76		*
19. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE PRINCIPAL.	1983	33	43	19		
	1984	43	33	23		
20. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THEIR TEACHER LEADER.	1983	36	31	28		
	1984	38	33	29		
21. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL(S).	1983	67	24	7	*	
	1984	59	24	17		
22. THE PRINCIPAL REGULARLY REVIEWS AND INTERPRETS TEST RESULTS WITH FACULTY.	1983	5	43	45		
	1984	2	21	74		*
23. THE PRINCIPAL FREQUENTLY COMMUNICATES TO TEACHERS THEIR RESPONSIBILITY IN RELATION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.	1983	48	17	36		
	1984	26	19	52		
24. THE PRINCIPAL REGULARLY ARRANGES OR PROMOTES STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.	1983	17	45	36		
	1984	5	55	38		
25. THE TEACHER LEADERS REGULARLY ARRANGE OR PROMOTE STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.	1983	40	43	14		
	1984	35	36	24		
26. THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL(S) REGULARLY ARRANGES OR PROMOTES STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.	1983	38	43	14		
	1984	38	48	12		
27. THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.	1983	43	21	28		
	1984	40	24	36		
28. TEACHER LEADERS AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.	1983	40	21	33		
	1984	33	26	36		
29. THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL(S) AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.	1983	59	14	17		
	1984	64	12	22		
30. FACULTY MEETINGS PRIMARILY DEAL WITH INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.	1983	7	62	28		
	1984	16	33	48		
AVERAGE	1983	34	27	34		
	1984	35	23	40		

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION	COSGROVE	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
31 AND 32.						
33. THERE IS A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PURPOSE WHICH GUIDES THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM OF THIS SCHOOL.	1983	33	26	36		
	1984	14	24	57		
34. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES ON WHICH A CURRICULAR AREA IS BASED EXIST AT ALL GRADES.	1983	24	19	50		
	1984	17	21	57		
35. SCHOOL-WIDE OBJECTIVES GUIDE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	24	29	45		
	1984	15	24	57		
36. EACH GRADE LEVEL OR SUBJECT AREA HAS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF SKILLS OR OBJECTIVES THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	24	9	64		
	1984	15	19	64		
37. WRITTEN SEQUENTIAL OBJECTIVES EXIST FOR THE COURSES IN THIS ACADEMIC AREA.	1983	19	31	48		
	1984	26	24	46		

38. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	12	36	52
	1984	12	26	58
39. IN MY ACADEMIC AREA SPECIFIC SKILLS ARE IDENTIFIED WHICH STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	19	9	71
	1984	21	24	52
40. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED MOST OFTEN TO CARRY OUT INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES ARE AVAILABLE.	1983	24	26	45
	1984	21	19	57
AVERAGE	1983	22	23	51
	1984	18	23	56

HIGH EXPECTATIONS	COSGROVE	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
41. NINETY PERCENT OR HIGHER OF STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER ESSENTIAL SKILLS IN MY PRIMARY DISCIPLINE.	1983	5	14	81		*
	1984	2	10	81		*
42. TEACHERS BELIEVE THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR STUDENTS TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS IN THEIR PRIMARY DISCIPLINE.	1983	24	17	59		
	1984	10	29	57.		
43. TEACHERS BELIEVE THAT ALL STUDENTS CAN MASTER BASIC SKILLS REGARDLESS OF HOME BACKGROUND FACTORS.	1983	31	31	38		
	1984	21	26	50		
44. TEACHERS HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS THAT ALL STUDENTS WILL LEARN.	1983	21	40	38		
	1984	12	19	64		
45. THE NUMBER OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN RETAINED IN CLASSES IN MY ACADEMIC AREA IS PROPORTIONATELY EQUIVALENT TO OTHERS RETAINED.	1983	5	5	64		
	1984	2	12	61		
46. ALMOST ALL STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL CAN BE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL.	1983	0	14	76		*
	1984	0	17	76		*
47. DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS ARE SPREAD ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES OF STUDENTS NOT JUST LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS.	1983	26	29	45		
	1984	31	29	36		
48. LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS OFTEN AS OTHERS DURING LARGE GROUP CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	19	36	40		
	1984	12	38	42		
49. IN MY ACADEMIC AREA MOST INITIAL INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	26	19	45		
	1984	19	19	55		
AVERAGE	1983	17	23	54		
	1984	12	22	58		

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK	COSGROVE	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
50. STUDENTS SPEND 85% OR MORE OF THE CLASS PERIOD ON PLANNED LEARNING ACTIVITIES.	1983	9	14	74		*
	1984	10	17	66		*
51. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION IS RARELY AFFECTED BY OUTSIDE INTERRUPTIONS.	1983	21	29	50		
	1984	16	33	46		
52. THERE ARE FEW STUDENT DISRUPTIONS DURING CLASS.	1983	7	43	50		
	1984	10	48	41		
53. LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME OF BASIC SKILL INSTRUCTION IS ALLOCATED FOR INDEPENDENT SEAT WORK.	1983	10	5	74		*
	1984	9	5	78		*
54. STUDENTS GENERALLY HAVE AT LEAST 75% OR BETTER OF ASSIGNED PRACTICE WORK CORRECT.	1983	5	19	64		
	1984	4	24	64		
55. INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS FOLLOW THE GENERAL FORMAT: PRESENTATION, PRACTICE AND OCCASIONAL FEEDBACK DURING PRACTICE.	1983	0	21	74		*
	1984	5	17	74		*
AVERAGE	1983	9	22	64		
	1984	9	24	62		

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS	COSGROVE				AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
56. THERE IS ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TESTING AT EACH GRADE LEVEL AND IN EACH COURSE.	1983	17	2	74		*
	1984	26	5	62		
57. ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS ARE SYSTEMATICALLY USED TO EVALUATE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.	1983	31	29	31		
	1984	38	31	23		
58. THE STANDARDIZED TESTS USED IN THIS SCHOOL ARE A VALID MEASURE OF THE CURRICULUM IN MY ACADEMIC AREA.	1983	31	29	31		
	1984	26	24	36		
59. STUDENT PROGRESS IN CLASS IS ASSESSED BY FREQUENT AND SYSTEMATIC SKILL TESTING.	1983	21	2	71		*
	1984	19	2	66		*
60. STUDENT PROGRESS IN CLASS IS ASSESSED SYSTEMATICALLY BY VARIOUS METHODS, CRT'S, UNIT TESTS, STUDENT WORK, ETC.	1983	9	17	62		
	1984	12	12	64		
61. INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM TESTING IN THE CLASSROOM IS USED FOR SPECIFIC FEEDBACK, AND INSTRUCTION IS AT LEAST SOMEWHAT CHANGED AS A RESULT.	1983	17	9	69		*
	1984	14	5	74		*
62. THERE IS A CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING PROGRAM IN MY ACADEMIC AREA.	1983	31	0	50		
	1984	31	0	57		
63. INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS USE CRT'S TO CHECK STUDENT MASTERY AND TO PLAN THE NEXT INSTRUCTIONAL SEQUENCE FOR THEIR GROUP.	1983	45	9	19		
	1984	43	10	35		
AVERAGE	1983	25	12	51		
	1984	26	11	52		

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS	COSGROVE				AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
64. THERE IS AN ACTIVE PARENT ORGANIZATION.	1983	86	7	5	*	
	1984	64	17	14		
65. PARENTS ARE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN SUPPORTING THE SCHOOL PROGRAM.	1983	69	21	7	*	
	1984	57	19	21		
66. A VAST MAJORITY OF PARENTS ATTEND SCHEDULED PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES.	1983	48	9	36		
	1984	26	17	42		
67. THERE IS FORMAL AND INFORMAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PARENTS AND TEACHERS.	1983	2	19	79		*
	1984	2	17	78		*
68. MANY PARENTS INITIATE TEACHER CONTACTS.	1983	69	17	12	*	
	1984	64	14	16		
69. THE SCHOOL HAS A WRITTEN POLICY ON HOMEWORK, AND HOMEWORK IS REGULARLY ASSIGNED TO ALL STUDENTS.	1983	17	17	62		
	1984	2	2	95		*
70. MOST PARENTS UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT THEIR ROLE IN MONITORING HOMEWORK.	1983	48	43	5		
	1984	26	33	38		
71. MORE THAN 75% OF STUDENTS COMPLETE ASSIGNED HOMEWORK.	1983	7	24	57		
	1984	7	14	65		

72. PARENTS WOULD EVALUATE THIS SCHOOL BY GIVING A GRADE OF A OR B.	1983	0	9	88
	1984	22	10	57
AVERAGE	1983	38	18	39
	1984	30	16	47

WILSON SCHOOL

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
1. ADULTS AND STUDENTS FEEL THAT THE ATMOSPHERE OF THE BUILDING IS SAFE AND ORDERLY.	1983	1%	30%	69%		*
	1984	0	28	72		*
2. SCHOOL AND CLASS BEHAVIOR ARE GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE.	1983	19	66	15		
	1984	16	70	13		
3. DISCIPLINE IS A SHARED RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	13	63	24		
	1984	3	70	27		
4. THE SCHOOL BUILDING IS CLEAN AND WELL TAKEN CARE OF BY STAFF AND STUDENTS.	1983	14	70	15		
	1984	20	70	10		
5. STUDENTS ARE GENERALLY POSITIVE ABOUT SCHOOL AND LEARNING.	1983	10	58	31		
	1984	6	56	38		
AVERAGE	1983	11	57	31		
	1984	9	59	32		

WILSON

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
6. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL.	1983	39	23	38		
	1984	36	34	28		
7. THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL PROMOTES FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.	1983	48	28	23		
	1984	36	39	23		
8. TEACHER LEADERS PROMOTE FREQUENT DISCUSSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.	1983	42	10	48		
	1984	41	15	45		
9. THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL MAKES FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	73	4	23	*	
	1984	80	8	11	*	
10. A TYPICAL FORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION IS PLANNED BY THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER AT A PRE-CONFERENCE FOLLOWED BY A POST-CONFERENCE.	1983	0	7	92		*
	1984	0	5	95		*
11. THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL ENGAGES IN A POST-OBSERVATION THREE TIMES A YEAR OR MORE.	1983	72	3	20	*	
	1984	82	5	13	*	
12. AFTER A CLASSROOM OBSERVATION THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL PROVIDES FEEDBACK PRIMARILY ON INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.	1983	7	18	75		*
	1984	3	10	87		*
13. THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL IS REGULARLY VISIBLE AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN THE SCHOOL.	1983	24	29	47		
	1984	12	33	56		
14. THE SCHOOL REQUIRES AND REVIEWS LESSON PLANS REGULARLY.	1983	65	31	4		
	1984	70	25	5	*	
15. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL.	1983	54	30	14		
	1984	69	26	3	*	
16. TEACHERS FREQUENTLY SEEK INSTRUCTIONAL ADVICE FROM THE TEACHER LEADER.	1983	25	46	25		
	1984	40	28	28		
17. THE PRINCIPAL REGULARLY REVIEWS AND INTERPRETS TEST RESULTS WITH FACULTY.	1983	10	30	46		
	1984	17	26	55		

18. THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FREQUENTLY COMMUNICATES TO TEACHERS THEIR RESPONSIBILITY IN RELATION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.	1983	22	13	62		
	1984	26	15	56		
19. THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL REGULARLY ARRANGES OR PROMOTES STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.	1983	48	38	11		
	1984	31	44	23		
20. THE TEACHER LEADER REGULARLY ARRANGES OR PROMOTES STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.	1983	30	38	31		
	1984	54	30	15		
21. THE PRINCIPAL OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.	1983	72	11	13	*	
	1984	54	21	22		
22. TEACHER LEADERS AND TEACHERS WORK TOGETHER TO COORDINATE THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM WITHIN AND BETWEEN GRADES.	1983	35	24	38		
	1984	44	21	31		
23. FACULTY MEETINGS PRIMARILY DEAL WITH INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES.	1983	70	21	8	*	
	1984	58	34	8		
AVERAGE	1983	41	22	34		
	1984	42	23	34		

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION	WILSON				AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
24 AND 25.						
26. THERE IS A WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PURPOSE WHICH GUIDES THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM OF THIS SCHOOL.	1983	34	32	27		
	1984	36	25	38		
27. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES ON WHICH A CURRICULAR AREA IS BASED EXIST AT ALL GRADES.	1983	15	14	65		
	1984	18	25	56		
28. SCHOOL-WIDE OBJECTIVES GUIDE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	23	22	51		
	1984	11	33	54		
29. EACH GRADE LEVEL OR SUBJECT AREA HAS AN IDENTIFIED SET OF SKILLS OR OBJECTIVES THAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	16	16	61		
	1984	10	20	68		*
30. WRITTEN SEQUENTIAL OBJECTIVES EXIST FOR THE COURSES IN THIS ACADEMIC AREA.	1983	20	22	58		
	1984	13	26	60		
31. IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES GUIDE MOST CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	19	19	57		
	1984	13	16	70		*
32. IN MY ACADEMIC AREA SPECIFIC SKILLS ARE IDENTIFIED WHICH STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER.	1983	11	16	69		*
	1984	13	11	76		*
33. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED MOST OFTEN TO CARRY OUT INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES ARE AVAILABLE.	1983	30	26	45		
	1984	25	30	46		
AVERAGE	1983	21	21	54		
	1984	17	23	59		

HIGH EXPECTATIONS	WILSON	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
34. NINETY PERCENT OR HIGHER OF STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO MASTER ESSENTIAL SKILLS IN MY PRIMARY DISCIPLINE.	1983	1	3	92		*
	1984	0	10	89		*
35. TEACHERS BELIEVE THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR STUDENTS TO MASTER BASIC SKILLS IN THEIR PRIMARY DISCIPLINE.	1983	16	12	70		*
	1984	11	13	75		*
36. TEACHERS BELIEVE THAT ALL STUDENTS CAN MASTER BASIC SKILLS REGARDLESS OF HOME BACKGROUND FACTORS.	1983	27	31	41		
	1984	20	25	56		
37. TEACHERS HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS THAT ALL STUDENTS WILL LEARN.	1983	22	19	58		
	1984	16	18	66		*
38. THE NUMBER OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN RETAINED IN CLASSES IN MY ACADEMIC AREA IS PROPORTIONATELY EQUIVALENT TO OTHERS RETAINED.	1983	7	4	51		
	1984	5	8	61		
39. ALMOST ALL STUDENTS IN THIS SCHOOL CAN BE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL.	1983	8	9	79		*
	1984	0	2	95		*
40. DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS ARE SPREAD ACROSS ALL CATEGORIES OF STUDENTS NOT JUST LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS.	1983	41	32	26		
	1984	41	26	33		
41. LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS OFTEN AS OTHERS DURING LARGE GROUP CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION.	1983	17	43	33		
	1984	21	41	36		
42. IN MY ACADEMIC AREA MOST INITIAL INSTRUCTION IS TO THE WHOLE CLASS WITH FOLLOW-UP INSTRUCTION TO SMALL GROUPS.	1983	28	23	37		
	1984	32	20	44		
AVERAGE	1983	19	20	54		
	1984	16	18	62		

OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND STUDENT TIME ON TASK	WILSON	CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	AREA OF MAJOR CONCERN	AREA OF MAJOR STRENGTH
43. STUDENTS SPEND 85% OR MORE OF THE CLASS PERIOD ON PLANNED LEARNING ACTIVITIES.	1983	7	4	81		*
	1984	5	13	79		*
44. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION IS RARELY AFFECTED BY OUTSIDE INTERRUPTIONS.	1983	30	26	38		
	1984	23	34	42		
45. THERE ARE FEW STUDENT DISRUPTIONS DURING CLASS.	1983	4	37	54		
	1984	11	43	46		
46. LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME OF BASIC SKILL INSTRUCTION IS ALLOCATED FOR INDEPENDENT SEAT WORK.	1983	8	4	80		*
	1984	5	11	83		*
47. STUDENTS GENERALLY HAVE AT LEAST 75% OR BETTER OF ASSIGNED PRACTICE WORK CORRECT.	1983	3	16	69		*
	1984	6	21	66		*
48. INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS FOLLOW THE GENERAL FORMAT: PRESENTATION, PRACTICE AND OCCASIONAL FEEDBACK DURING PRACTICE.	1983	4	12	80		*
	1984	3	21	71		*
AVERAGE	1983	9	17	67		*
	1984	9	24	65		

FREQUENT MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS

WILSON

					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
49. THERE IS ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TESTING AT EACH GRADE LEVEL AND IN EACH COURSE.	1983	21	5	58		
	1984	19	8	64		
50. ANNUAL STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS ARE SYSTEMATICALLY USED TO EVALUATE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES.	1983	31	24	29		
	1984	43	21	34		
51. THE STANDARDIZED TESTS USED IN THIS SCHOOL ARE A VALID MEASURE OF THE CURRICULUM IN MY ACADEMIC AREA.	1983	20	22	39		
	1984	30	15	51		
52. STUDENT PROGRESS IN CLASS IS ASSESSED BY FREQUENT AND SYSTEMATIC SKILL TESTING.	1983	16	0	77		*
	1984	8	0	84		*
53. STUDENT PROGRESS IN CLASS IS ASSESSED SYSTEMATICALLY BY VARIOUS METHODS, CRT'S, UNIT TESTS, STUDENT WORK, ETC.	1983	9	6	73		*
	1984	7	20	67		*
54. INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM TESTING IN THE CLASSROOM IS USED FOR SPECIFIC FEEDBACK, AND INSTRUCTION IS AT LEAST SOMEWHAT CHANGED AS A RESULT.	1983	11	3	74		*
	1984	12	10	75		*
55. THERE IS A CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING PROGRAM IN MY ACADEMIC AREA.	1983	53	0	18		
	1984	46	8	40		
56. INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS USE CRT'S TO CHECK STUDENT MASTERY AND TO PLAN THE NEXT INSTRUCTIONAL SEQUENCE FOR THEIR GROUP.	1983	30	9	16		
	1984	36	16	35		
AVERAGE	1983	24	9	48		
	1984	25	12	56		

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

WILSON

					AREA OF MAJOR	
		CONCERN	NEUTRAL	STRENGTH	CONCERN	STRENGTH
57. THERE IS AN ACTIVE PARENT ORGANIZATION.	1983	73	8	4	*	
	1984	97	0	2	*	
58. PARENTS ARE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN SUPPORTING THE SCHOOL PROGRAM.	1983	73	15	7	*	
	1984	83	10	5	*	
59. A VAST MAJORITY OF PARENTS ATTEND SCHEDULED PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES.	1983	64	4	16		
	1984	68	7	19	*	
60. THERE IS FORMAL AND INFORMAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PARENTS AND TEACHERS.	1983	24	18	57		
	1984	15	30	55		
61. MANY PARENTS INITIATE TEACHER CONTACTS.	1983	84	11	3	*	
	1984	79	20	2	*	
62. THE SCHOOL HAS A WRITTEN POLICY ON HOMEWORK, AND HOMEWORK IS REGULARLY ASSIGNED TO ALL STUDENTS.	1983	32	39	22		
	1984	12	16	72		*
63. MOST PARENTS UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT THEIR ROLE IN MONITORING HOMEWORK.	1983	50	32	10		
	1984	51	44	3		
64. MORE THAN 75% OF STUDENTS COMPLETE ASSIGNED HOMEWORK.	1983	5	20	59		
	1984	5	20	67		*

PARENTS WOULD EVALUATE THIS SCHOOL BY GIVING A GRADE OF A OR B.	1983	0	3	66
	1984	16	15	64
AVERAGE	1983	45	17	30
	1984	48	18	32